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Abstract

Although a number of scholars in past centuries have viewed the Hebrew of Daniel 8-12 as translation from Aramaic, only F. Zimmermann and H. L. Ginsberg have put forward a large body of evidence to support this theory. It has not been accepted as proof and the issue has been left open. This work appraises their evidence through: study of the general character of the Masoretic Text and the difficulties of its language; detailed description of their evidence with additional material adduced by L. F. Hartman, and H. H. Rowley's and John J. Collins' brief rebuttals. It proceeds to critique both sides of the argument, rejecting any form of Aramaism including calque and particularly semantic interference, as ultimate proof of translation from an Aramaic Vorlage. These conclusions are reached through reflection on the similarities between thought and written text. Since the proponents paid little attention to textual evidence for comparison with their Aramaic solutions to problems in the Hebrew, a vertical and horizontal study of primary textual witnesses was carried out to compare with the small amount of their evidence which seemed to indicate an Aramaic Vorlage. The textual study itself produced two examples where variation between the Masoretic text and the Old Greek could be solved by recourse to Aramaic. This set the eventual direction of the work towards analysis of textual solutions by retroversion of the Masoretic Text to Aramaic and the Versions to Hebrew and Aramaic, and by interaction with recent textual studies in Daniel. Two types of evidence are collated; calque, which is ambiguous but supportive, and evidence for an Aramaic manuscript behind the Hebrew. It concludes that absolute proof is not possible, but the instincts, not the methods of Zimmermann and Ginsberg were correct: the Hebrew probably was translated from Aramaic, and the Old Greek is a translation of a translation.

I, Janet May Rollinson, hereby declare that both this thesis and the research upon which it is based are my own work and of no other.

30th September 2002
Every text has a history, and the story of this one began when a long-cherished ambition on my part to study the biblical book of Daniel was fulfilled, and under the guidance of Dr Peter Hayman I began reading the Hebrew chapters 8-12. It was in the course of our struggling to make sense of the Masoretic Text, that he introduced me to the concept of the language as translation from Aramaic. The challenge of a linguistic investigation was taken up and from then began an intensive collection of the evidence. It was not immediately obvious until a year into the work that a text-critical examination of the text would be needed, but the point of this realisation the nature of the work to be undertaken was truly determined.

Challenging too has been the work of recording the research which has covered a period of seven years of part-time study, during which time a number of technical problems arose in the area of computing. A file became corrupted and it was replaced by one that was scanned from a hard copy of a draft. This resulted in some visually subtle spelling errors entering it, e.g. Qumran might be found spelt Qurnran, and it necessitated much careful scrutiny of the text. The irony of this situation was not lost on the writer of this particular thesis! I regret that one difficulty, that of the footnotes sometimes placed by the program on the page following the number have not been overcome.

I have attempted to keep texts which need to be closely compared on the same page, though this has not always been possible. It has required some large spaces in the text of the thesis, but in these cases continuation should be indicated at the bottom of the page.

Despite all the challenges, I would say this research has been an adventure, and if the reader is not used to thinking of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible in this way, I hope this exploration of Daniel 8-12 in the light of the views of F Zimmermann and H L Ginsberg will lead to a change of mind.
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INTRODUCTION

The Bilingual Text of Daniel

The bilingual character of the biblical book of Daniel is a feature obvious and well-known to scholars of the Hebrew Bible. The book of Ezra shares the same characteristic, but there the Aramaic is confined to letters of correspondence in the context of the Persian empire, of which Aramaic was the official language, and all the narrative and other material is in Hebrew. In contrast Daniel has narrative and visionary material in Aramaic and in Hebrew thus:

1-2:4a Introductory tale of exile in Babylonian court Hebrew
2:4b - 6:28 Court tales of the exiles in Babylonian court Aramaic
7:1-28 Vision in the reign of Belshazzar Aramaic
8:1-27 Vision in the reign of Belshazzar Hebrew
9:1-3 Narrative introduction to a prayer in the Persian period; Hebrew
9:4-19 A prayer of Daniel Hebrew
9:20 - 12:13 Further visionary material in the Persian period Hebrew

Chapter 7 prevents any neat correlation between genre and language, because all the Aramaic except the vision in this chapter is the medium of the court tales. Similarly chapter 1 confounds any idea that Hebrew was reserved only for the visions. Many and various theories have been put forward to explain this bilingual conundrum, but little agreement has been reached, except to say that the prayer in 9:4-19 was a Hebrew composition, in keeping with the normal Jewish practice.1

---
1 J J Collins, Daniel (Hermeneia, 1993, Minneapolis, Fortress), 12-13, 29.
The Aramaic of Daniel

The Aramaic of Daniel 2:2a - 7:28 has been classed as Imperial Aramaic, or *Reichsaramäisch*, of the Persian Achaemenid empire, and possibly Eastern Aramaic. There have been many descriptions of the characteristics of the Aramaic in Daniel over the past century, and these have usually centered on the vexed debate concerning the date of BA. The issue of date is not important to this thesis, and it need only be noted in addition to these descriptions that the Aramaic of Daniel is of a good, clear quality, written in a flowing style. The same cannot be said for the Hebrew of Daniel.

The Hebrew of Daniel Chapters 8-12

The Hebrew of Daniel has been classified as Late Biblical Hebrew on the basis that it has several characteristics in common with other texts in the Hebrew Bible regarded as LBH. Cohortative forms are used for first singular imperfects, as in Ezra and Nehemiah. There is preference for נָשָׁה instead of the nouns נָשָׁה, and this is characteristic of Esther and Chronicles. Added to these is preference for the Niphal stem, as evidenced also in Chronicles, and use of the first singular

---

4 Collins, *Daniel*, 13-17; Stefanovic, *The Aramaic*, 13-23: the uncertainty in dating the Aramaic of Daniel is of course part of the debate concerning the date of BA as a whole.
5 There are fourteen occurrences of first singular cohortative forms used with Vav consecutives: 8:2 (twice); 8:3; 8:13; 8:15; 10:8; 10:9; 10:16; 10:19; 12:8; 12:9; 12:10; 12:16; 12:17. They are absent from ch 11 since it is entirely in the third person. The cohortative is not used exclusively: note e.g. 8:3; 10:5; 10:8; 12:7.
pronoun, יִדְרֵךְ, instead of יַכָּלֵךְ. Some of these features have much in common with Qumran Hebrew. At present the diachronic categories of Biblical Hebrew are under review in the light of computer aided research, unavailable to scholars in previous centuries and decades. Whether the definition of LBH can survive this new research remains to be seen, but for the time being it will be retained as a label usually denoting the language of the biblical books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Daniel, Qoheleth, Canticles and 1 & 2 Chronicles.

Aramaic influence on LBH has been generally acknowledged, although the specific bounds of its influence are difficult to define. The verdict of Driver was that the writer of Daniel was more at home in Aramaic than in Hebrew, and many Aramaisms in the text have been documented over the years. Some of these have been found in Qumran Hebrew, and others in later Mishnaic Hebrew.

The style of Hebrew in Daniel 8-12 is far from smooth and the sense often obscure. Sometimes common roots, such as הָנִשֵׁה and יַכָּלֵךְ, which have a breadth of semantic range, are difficult to construe in context; at other times rare or unique vocabulary or forms add to the obfuscation. Collins has pronounced the Hebrew text of Daniel

---

6 יִדְרֵךְ occurs twenty-two times: in 8:1, 2 (twice), 5, 15, 27; 9:2, 20, 21, 23; 10:2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 20; 11:1; 12:5, 8. (It is found once in ch 1, in v 10.) By contrast, יַכָּלֵךְ is used only once, in 10:11.


8 Collins, Daniel, 21 and notes 207, 208, 218.


12 Montgomery, A Critical, 14, regarded the number of Aramaic words in Hebrew Daniel as ‘not large’, but Collins, Daniel, 21, says there are ‘numerous Aramaisms’, though his list contains many Persian loan-words found in ch 1.

13 Collins, ibid. and notes 205, 206.
8-12 ‘difficult’ because of corruption, which may be related to the problems of the language itself.\textsuperscript{14}

**Translation Theories of the Twentieth Century**

The first person to expound the theory that the Hebrew of Daniel 8-12 was a translation from Aramaic on the basis of a large amount of linguistic evidence was Frank Zimmermann, initially in two articles written in 1938\textsuperscript{15} and 1939.\textsuperscript{16} According to Zimmermann, this theory had earlier been suggested by four scholars, C H H Wright,\textsuperscript{17} Buhl,\textsuperscript{18} Marti\textsuperscript{19} and Charles,\textsuperscript{20} but only Charles had done so on the basis of language. Wright had put forward no proof; Marti had relied on the evidence of Hophal and Hitpael forms, which Montgomery rightly considered ‘meagre’.\textsuperscript{21}

Although Charles put forward linguistic evidence in his commentary on Daniel to suggest that there were three different translators, this evidence was directed towards establishing the diversity of translators and not towards proving the basic thesis of translation as opposed to authorship. His evidence was roundly refuted by Reider.\textsuperscript{22} Until Zimmermann published his first two articles, there was scant evidence put forward to further the cause of this theory.

Zimmermann’s work convinced H Louis Ginsberg, who in 1948, in his book, *Studies in Daniel*, showed that he agreed with most of Zimmermann’s evidence, and he

\textsuperscript{14} Collins, *Daniel*, 22-3.
\textsuperscript{16} F Zimmermann, ‘Some Verses in Daniel in the Light of a Translation Hypothesis’, *JBL* 58 (1939), 349-54.
\textsuperscript{17} C H H Wright *Daniel and His Prophecies*, 1906, 53. Montgomery traces the first idea of Daniel written completely in Aramaic to Huetius (d. 1721) in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, 472, cited by L Bertholdt, *Daniel* (1806), 51; cf also Collins, *Daniel*, 13.
\textsuperscript{19} D K Marti, *Das Buch Daniel* (1901, Tübingen, J C B Mohr).
applied the principles that Zimmermann employed in other passages not treated by him.

In 1960-61 Zimmermann published a third article with more evidence deduced from the text of Hebrew Daniel.\(^{23}\) In 1975 he published his definitive work about the theory on Hebrew Daniel, incorporating all the evidence in his three articles, some of Ginsberg’s ideas, plus more of his own material.\(^{24}\) This work, and some earlier articles\(^{25}\), showed that his theory of the translation of some of the Hebrew of MT from Aramaic had expanded to include other biblical books in part or whole, including Jonah, Esther, Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.

The works of Ginsberg and Zimmermann were in turn influential upon Louis F Hartman, who demonstrated his acceptance of the theory in his explanatory notes, contained in the 1978 commentary on Daniel completed by Alexander A Di Lella.\(^{26}\) Lacocque has also accepted the theory and has incorporated a number of Zimmermann’s and Ginsberg’s ideas in his commentary, but by no means all of them.\(^{27}\)

Angel Sáenz-Badillos has pronounced it possible that Hebrew Daniel was translated from Aramaic, but still unproven.\(^{28}\) John J Collins, in his commentary on Daniel, considers the theory unsound, since it rests upon emendations of the Hebrew consonantal text and assumptions about the Hebrew text. Added to this, he objected to the fact that so much of the evidence relies on theoretical misreadings of the


\(^{24}\) F Zimmermann, Biblical Books Translated from the Aramaic (1975, New York, Ktav).


\(^{27}\) A Lacocque, The Book of Daniel (trans D Pellauer, 1979, Atlanta, John Knox); cf P R Davies, Daniel (Society for Old Testament Study Old Testament Guides, 1985, Sheffield, JSOTP), 36.

\(^{28}\) Sáenz-Badillos, A History, 122.
Aramaic ‘original’. However, in his rejection of the theory he deals only with the evidence presented by Ginsberg and Hartman. Clearly the medium of a commentary did not allow space for analysis of Zimmermann’s much larger body of evidence, and this, plus the fact that Sáenz-Badillos leaves the issue open, suggests the need for a more detailed and thorough assessment of the evidence.

The language theory is inextricably linked to literary theory as the bilingual character of the book is part of the broader problems of source theory and dating, but the language must be studied as objectively as possible apart from dependence on a particular theory. Accordingly this thesis will not describe or discuss any source-critical aspects of Daniel 8-12.

Method of Investigation

This investigation developed firstly from a simple reading of MT and encounter with the difficulties of making sense of the text: the first task was a straightforward logging, verse by verse, of those difficulties.

It continued with the reading and logging of evidence adduced by F Zimmermann, H L Ginsberg and L F Hartman, followed by a broad analysis of how this material could be categorised. This categorisation was informed by general reflection on the similarities between the processes involved in translating a thought text, i.e. which is only verbalised in the mind, and a written text, and of how calque can be characteristic of both. The reading and categorisation was followed by an evaluation of their methods, which reached the conclusion that they had failed, among other things, to take sufficient account of the textual evidence normally examined in trying to construe the meaning of a difficult biblical Hebrew text.

This conclusion determined the next stage of investigation, an analysis of the primary witnesses to the text of Daniel 8-12. This was achieved first by vertical readings of

---

29 Collins, Daniel, 23.
each witness, followed by horizontal examination of the five chapters, verse by verse, in which all the variant readings against those of MT were noted. It was intended to compare the relevant textual material with a kernel of evidence adduced by Zimmermann and Ginsberg which seemed to suggest translation from a written text. However, before this comparison was begun, the text-critical study itself forced a different approach, because it yielded two possible examples of evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage in 11:6, 31 where OG differed from MT.

This complicated the task of analysis because, with every example of text examined, it became necessary to appraise the textual evidence for both a Hebrew and an Aramaic solution. In the case of some items suggested by these scholars, it was necessary to evaluate a larger section of text than they had, in order to obtain a clearer understanding of the evidence in context. When this comparison was, as far as possible, complete, additional words and phrases in MT where there seemed potential for evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage, mainly where MT and OG disagreed, were investigated in the same manner.

Lastly, the evidence was reviewed and all examples which either were resolvable in Hebrew, or in both Hebrew and Aramaic equally, or neither, were discounted, along with any solutions which entailed a novel interpretation of the meaning of the text.

Two types of evidence were elicited in this way: calque which may be supportive of an Aramaic Vorlage, but which is ambiguous; and evidence for some form of confusion in an Aramaic consonantal text.
Calque

A definition of calque has been provided by Kutscher,\textsuperscript{30} and Sáenz-Badillos also treats this subject under the definition ‘loan-translation’.\textsuperscript{31} Although detailed sub-divisions of this linguistic phenomenon have been provided,\textsuperscript{32} such analysis has not been attempted in this context for examples of calque detected, since the primary differentiation sought is between lexical processes taking place purely in thought, and those which entail reading the graphic medium.

The Textual Evidence

The texts available for the study of the book of Daniel have been exhaustively described by John J Collins in his commentary,\textsuperscript{33} and the textual witnesses to chs 7-12 in particular have been listed by Sharon Pace Jeansonne with a good description of the characteristics of each witness.\textsuperscript{34} Qumran fragments of Daniel have been described by Eugene Ulrich.\textsuperscript{35}

The analysis in this study was undertaken at an auspicious time in that it benefited from many developments in the latter part of the twentieth century. These included the full publication of the Qumran fragments of Daniel through the work of Ulrich, together with the CD-ROM of all the Qumran texts\textsuperscript{36} and two volumes of Studies in

\textsuperscript{30} Kutscher, \textit{A History}, 76 \# 106.
\textsuperscript{31} Sáenz-Badillos, \textit{A History}, 121-2; 201 for ‘loan-translation’; cf 364 index listing.
\textsuperscript{34} S Pace Jeansonne, \textit{The Old Greek Translation of Daniel} 7-12 (CBQ Monograph 19, 1988, Washington DC, Catholic Biblical Association of America), 5-12.
\textsuperscript{35} For fragments of Daniel 8-12, see notes 42-5 below. Fragments of chs 1-7 are included in those articles. A more recent description of all is found in E Ulrich, ‘The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls’, in J J Collins & P W Flint (eds), \textit{The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception} Vol 2, (2001, Leiden et al, Brill), 573-85.
\textsuperscript{36} TH Lim & P S Alexander (eds), \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls on CD-ROM} (1996, Oxford, OUP).
the Dead Sea Scrolls. For the Greek text, the entire publication of P 967, work on OG of chs 7-12 by Jeansonne, and on selected texts from both OG and Theodotion by Tim McLay.\(^{37}\) Not only was a critical text of the Peshitta of Daniel made available by the Peshitta Institute in Leiden, but also the work of R A Taylor, a thorough analysis of the Peshitta in relation to MT.\(^{38}\) Not least must be mentioned the invaluable resource of the most recent scholarly commentary on Daniel by John J Collins.

This work also benefited from the excellent Special Collection of New College Library in the University of Edinburgh, which provided convenient access, not only to volumes of Kennicott and De Rossi, but also to Bugatus’ 1788 edition of the Syro-Hexapla of Daniel. The full list of texts consulted is as follows:

The Hebrew Texts

The Masoretic Text according to *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*\(^ {39}\)
The variant Hebrew readings of Daniel according to J B De-Rossi\(^ {40}\)
The variant Hebrew readings of Daniel according to Kennicott\(^ {41}\)
The following Qumran fragments of Daniel chs 8-12:

4QDan\(^ a\) (4Q 112)\(^ {42}\)
4QDan\(^ b\) (4Q 113)\(^ {43}\)
4QDan\(^ c\) (4Q 114)\(^ {44}\)
Pap6QDan (6Q7 Pap Dan)\(^ {45}\)

\(^{38}\) Taylor, *The Peshitta*, cf note 33.
\(^{41}\) B Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum; cum Variis Lectionibus*, Tomus II (1780, Oxonii, E. Typographiceo Clarendoniano).
The Greek Witnesses

OG and θ texts of Daniel according to the Septuagint of A Rahlfs
OG and θ texts of Daniel with other Greek variant readings according to J Ziegler
The Old Greek of Daniel according to Papyrus 967

The Syriac Witnesses

The Peshitta of Daniel
The Syro-Hexapla

The Latin Witness

The Vulgate text of Daniel according to B Fischer

---

45 M Baillet & J T Milik, Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise; Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 6Q, 7Q A, 10 Q; Manches (DJD 3, 1962, Oxford, Clarendon), pl. XXIII.
50 C Bugatus, Daniel Secundum Editionem LXX Interpretum ex Tetrapolis Desumptum ex Codice Syro-estranghelo Bibliothecae Ambrosianae (1788, Medioli, Typographio Monasterii Imperialis S. Ambrosii).
Approach to the Textual Study

Sharon Pace Jeansonne has summarised the witnesses to the oldest recoverable Semitic text (H) of Daniel as M (the Masoretic Text), Q (the Qumran readings) and G (the Greek witnesses). More recently Timothy Lim has cast doubt on the Qumran witnesses as necessarily independent from the Greek.\(^\text{52}\) For practical purposes the Qumran readings are fragmentary and do not provide a quantitatively significant number of variant readings in the broad context of a study of five whole chapters of Daniel. A simple comparison of all the above witnesses shows that the majority of variations occur between MT and OG, and that, when these two witnesses diverge, the others, including the Qumran fragments, usually agree with one of them. Times when the other witnesses deviate from this pattern may be of significance, but each occasion must be judged on its own merits. So the pattern of variant readings most frequently groups the witnesses to the text of Daniel 8-12 as, on the one hand, MT, θ, the Peshitta and Vulgate, and on the other, OG, Papyrus 967 and the Syro-Hexapla. The more fragmentary readings of Qumran and the Greek witnesses α and σ may, on occasion, give independent readings of interest.

Lastly, the study was informed by a number of excellent introductions to textual criticism of the Hebrew and Greek texts, not least of which are the recent works of E Tov.\(^\text{53}\)


The development of the classical Aramaic scripts of the Persian period has been described by Naveh, and of the Jewish scripts in the Greek and Roman period by Cross. Naveh has noted that a style which may become archaic can nevertheless persist for decades afterwards, and a range of styles, varying from the classical Aramaic to the formal Jewish of the second century CE, has been collated by Cross. In considering the transmission of the text of Daniel, based on the commonly assumed date of the late second century BCE for its writing, it seemed wise to allow for a broad range of styles, from the proto-Jewish formal hand of the late third century BCE to the post-Herodian period.

The common confusions that can be found between various Hebrew letters in both the archaic and later scripts are well documented, and the graphic similarities between these letters are easily observed in the scripts collated by Naveh, Cross and also Birnbaum. Ligature is an important graphic phenomenon which needs to be considered in any textual investigation.

Whilst examining in some detail the scripts outlined above and the textual witnesses to Daniel, two graphic confusions of some importance to this study were observed.

---

56 Naveh, The Development, 4.
58 Cross, 'The Development', 137, line 4: the example is from 4QSam\(^b\).
59 See the last examples supplied by Cross, 'The Development', 139, lines 9 & 10.
that were not listed in any of the introductions to textual criticism. These are described in Chapter Four.

The Retroversions

Retroversions into Aramaic follow a policy of formal equivalence to the Hebrew in word order, since many of the Versions do the same in relation to their Hebrew Vorlagen. This helps to counteract any tendency to change the word order to that most advantageous for an Aramaic solution! Nevertheless, some variation in the Aramaic syntax is allowed for to produce the best solution possible, especially where there may be a choice with unpredictable outcome, the most common example being the Aramaic genitive constructions.

At first the difficult diachronics of the two languages, LBH and BA may seem to be an issue in retroversion: what type of Aramaic should be used for this purpose? In practice the style and language of BA has been the first guide, followed by QA, informed by reading the Genesis Apocryphon and by recent works on QA63. The precise dating of these language types is not so important as their representation of Jewish Aramaic in the broad time band sixth to first century and in the region of Palestine and eastwards, rather than the Egyptian type of the Elephantine Papyri.

So, for example, the particle מ is employed in preference to prefixed מ in keeping with BA and QA64, demonstrative ידנ as opposed to י. Verb stems are employed according to their attestation in firstly BA, then QA and TA: orthography tends to the defectiva as does MT, rather than the plene sometimes found at Qumran or in the Targums, though some freedom has been exercised in exploring what particular spelling may be the basis for a given textual problem in either Hebrew or Aramaic.

---

63 The most helpful have been, T Muraoka, Studies in Qumran Aramaic (Abr Nahrain Sup 3, 1992, Louvain, Peeters); J A Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Cave 1: A Commentary (2nd edn, 1971, Rome, Pontifical Bible Institute).

64 Ros 21, # 35; Collins, Daniel, 16.
Common semantic equivalents are employed where at all possible. Research on these has been indebted to *A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets*, the succeeding volumes of which have been published during the time of this research. Where a word is attested only in usage later than BA or QA, the earlier occurrence of the word is being adduced.65

**The Structure of the Thesis**

The structure of the thesis generally follows the chronological order of the research, and the text of Hebrew Daniel 8-12 may be seen as passing through a series of 'sieves' in order to extract a progressively smaller amount of valuable material! The characteristics of the language in all five chapters are described in Chapter One, but the material has been presented in categories, rather than verse by verse to prevent inordinate repetition.

The material is reduced in Chapter Two and Three to those words, expressions and sections of text dealt with by Zimmermann, Ginsberg and Hartman, with their analyses described in some detail. Chapters Four to Six more drastically reduce the material to only those texts chosen by Zimmermann and Ginsberg which may possibly support their thesis of a translation from an Aramaic Vorlage. An even smaller amount survives the 'sieve' of textual criticism in these chapters to emerge in Chapter Eight among the evidence supporting their views. Chapter Seven contains additional material, gleaned through textual analysis for the most part, to be tested by textual 'sifting' again.

The first three chapters are predominantly descriptive, except for the reflective comments. Although many of the elements in them are never revisited in the later

65 I cannot for example agree with Sokoloff's reasoning concerning root יִמָּה #2, that it cannot be connected to Ja root #2 to 'lift, bear', 'since this verb occurs only in TBA'. If a meaning of a word suits a context in literature of a certain date or type in which it has not before been attested, this in itself should be taken as evidence of its usage in a broader time or genre range than has been previously apparent.
chapters, they are necessary as part of a holistic picture of the nature of the problems with the Hebrew, and the solutions provided by the scholars concerned.

Some texts appear only in Chapter One, some in the first two parts, and a few in all three parts. To maintain these divisions of the research, Ch 11:6 is treated in two sections; v 6a in Chapter Four, and v 6b in Chapter Seven.

The Versions and Their Vorlagen

There has been no authoritative material adduced in this work to suggest that any of the Versions, even OG, was directly dependent on an Aramaic Vorlage. At all times when a variant in one of the Versions is traced to Aramaic, the implication is intended, without being constantly repeated, that this has been reflected in the Hebrew manuscript of the translator of the particular version concerned66. Retroversions from a version to Aramaic therefore reflect this view throughout.

---

66 It may be possible to raise the question of fragmentary manuscripts in Hebrew and Aramaic for OG, but this is a complex issue, and it lies outside the bounds of this research.
Chapter One

Characteristics of the Language of the Masoretic Text in Daniel Chs 8 - 12

The following description of the characteristics of MT of Daniel 8-12 aims to show the elements that contribute to its difficulties. Terms such as ‘rare’ or ‘unique’ relate to MT as a whole. At this preliminary stage of study, few text-critical observations are made. Some indication of the distribution of less common words and expressions in the MT is provided, but this aspect of the study is not exhaustive. The categorisations are fluid because some expressions fit into more than one group.

Two Characteristics of LBH in Daniel 8-12

The Niphal Stem

This stem is employed some sixty-six times in Daniel 8-12! In five chapters this is an average of thirteen per chapter, well in excess of Chronicles which has 219 occurrences, or an average of between three and four per chapter.1 The following are notable uses in Daniel 8-12, including some that are unique or rare.

8:1 נַעֲשָׂה ... תִּפְרֵדָה The first phrase is unique to Daniel, employing the Niphal stem of נַעֲשָׂה following לַעֲשָׂהוּ. The Hebrew words for ‘vision’ are usually accompanied by a finite active form of root לָאָר. The first verb is pointed as perfect ( cf Gen 48:3; Exod 3:16; 4:1f ), but it could also be a participle. The second verb might naturally be assumed to be a participle, לָאָרָנָה, as in Gen 12:7; 35:1, since it has the article. The pointing of the participle may be in pause: KB3 cites another example in 1 Kgs 11:9 as a participle. GKC 138 k

---

1 The total number of uses of the Niphal stem in Daniel supplied by computer was 71, with five of these in 1-2:4a. Nehemiah has 62 in thirteen chapters, an average of nearly five per chapter.
lists them both as dubious perfects which should be participles. If both in Daniel are participles, there is no main verb in the verse. See also 10:1.

8:14 יַ֣דוֹן lists the Niphal of root מָדוֹן is found only in Daniel in MT. It could mean 'will be vindicated' or 'will be set right' in this context.

8:18 נִכְרָא means 'I was in a deep sleep'; cf BDB, 922, Judg 4:21; Jon 1:5; KB3 Vol 3, 1191, 'in a drugged sleep', or 'be dazed, stunned' in Ps 76:7, Dan 8:18; 10:9. The context seems to require the meaning 'I was lying down' and there is no reference to Daniel waking out of sleep afterwards. Cf 10:9.

8:27 נְנַהֲמוּ is the only example of a first singular Niphal of the root נָהֲמָ, and the verb in this stem is used elsewhere in MT only 21 times. It is usually given the meaning 'to be done / finished' here, in 2:1, and in Mic 2:4, where, however, most scholars would delete it as dittography after the expression נָהֲמָ ה.
10:7 The Niphal infinitive construct of רבד is found only here and 2 Chr 18:24. With ב it means literally ‘into hiddenness / hiding’, i.e. it functions as a noun since ‘when they hid’ does not make sense in context. For the Niphal of הב, cf Josh 10:16, 17; 1 Sam 10:22; Amos 9:3 and Job 29:10 in MT.

10:8 These forms occur in the same verse, and there may have been reduplication, especially since the same information is given in two different ways: לולא עצרתי כה ולא נשאר וב ח. ה contributes to a unique reading. See page 28 and cf 10:16 below.

10:9 Cf 8:18. See Gib 113f rem 2 for חי and the participle.

10:13 This verb is common in the Niphal stem, but it occurs only 5 times in the 1st person, in 1 Kgs 18:22; 19:10, 14 and here. It usually means ‘be left, remain’, but in this context seems to require the meaning ‘be superfluous’.

10:16 This time יפל in the Niphal is part of a rare expression. See page 35 and cf 10:8 above.

11:4 The Niphal of רבד, ‘divide’, is rare; cf (only) 1 Kgs 2:8, 14; Ezek 37:22. A syntactical problem arises because Vav and the jussive usually indicate a purpose clause; cf Gib 87a: and an ordinary imperfect should describe future events which occur in the same time scale; cf Gib 85b.

11:6 Cf 8:12. It is a struggle to find an adequate translation for the Niphal of הע, since no indirect object is indicated: this stem is usually followed by a prepositional phrase using either ל, ב or אל.

11:30 This rare verb occurs only here and Ps 109:16, both Niphal, and in
Ezek 13:22 where it is Hiphil. (There is a possible adjective from root נק in Ps 10:10, a *hapax legomenon.*) It is variously translated 'draw back startled' or 'be disheartened / cowed'.

**The Root עמד**

Words of this root occur some forty-one times in chs 8-12. In addition to its classical semantic range of 'stand, stand firm, remain, endure', it carries the sense of קם, i.e. 'arise, stand up', in 8:22, 23, 25; 10:11; 11:3, 7, 20, 21, 30 (a Hiphil); 12:1.

8:17 עמד, cf v 18 and 10:11; 11:1. This could be an infinitive construct used as a substantive:7 It is listed in the lexicons as a noun, קם, cf CI Vol 1, 363; KB3 Vol 2, 842. KB3 cites at least six other occurrences in MT where it means 'location, place'.

10:11 עמד על לעכה For cf 8:17, 18; 11:1. This seems to mean עמד על לעכה, but if it carries the literal sense 'upon your rising', after the analogy with קם, the clause could be translated 'stand upright', or simply 'stand up!'

11:1 עמד appears to be infinitive construct with a first singular suffix, but a finite verb is required in the clause. BDB, 764, 7g, lists the reading as corrupt and KB3, Vol 2, 840, reads a participle. Cf 8:17, 18; 10:11. 4QDan8 reads עמדתך.

11:2 עמד seems to mean 'remaining' in this context, but this use of a participle, implying a continuous situation, is rather strained in describing the consecutive reign of kings, and the clause is without a finite verb.

---

7 BW classifies only 8:17, 18 as the noun עמד and gives the total number of occurrences of the verb עמד in Daniel as forty-three, including four examples in 1-2:4a.

11:7 וְתַאֲמִית. Cf vv 3, 20; 8:18. This is an example that should be translated in context ‘will arise’. There is no specified subject and perhaps the impersonal should be understood.

11:11 הָעַטּוֹם הָהֵם. The Hiphil seems to carry the sense ‘raise (a crowd / army)’, though it could, in a military context, mean ‘deploy’.

11:15 הָאָרָיִם הָכֵם These clauses refer to the inability of the southern forces to resist those of the north. The verbs could be translated, ‘they will not endure / remain...and there will be no resistance’. Cf page 51 for the difficult syntax of the second verb.

11:16 והָאָרָיִם is difficult in syntax again: it seems to mean ‘there will be no withstanding him’.

 could mean ‘he will stand / take his stand / remain’.

11:17 הָאָרָיִם It is difficult to find a translation for this feminine verb. If תַּאֲמִית is the subject, it may mean ‘she will not endure’. It could be impersonal feminine, ‘it (i.e. the plan) will not endure’, in other words, the plan will not come to fruition.

**Ketib / Qere Variants**

8:11 K יֶרֶםְהוּ and Q רָםְהוּ differ between a Hiphil and a Hophal respectively;

9:18 The K is feminine in form but Q reads masculine. However compare imperatives in v 19 which also carry final ה: this suggests a feminine verb is.

not intended but rather an ending similar to the cohortative. Cf GKC 48 for lengthened imperatives.

11:8 הַכֵּן K has consonants of a Qal, but Q reads Hiphil to give a better sense.

11:10 וְאָדָם K is a singular noun but Q is plural, ‘his sons’, to agree with the plural verb which follows.

... The initial confusion as to number returns at the end of the verse. The second occurrence of the verb is in K a plural and in Q a singular to agree with the preceding verb.

... The consonantal text means ‘as far as a stronghold’, which is less informative than the Q, the pointing of which is preferable, meaning, ‘as far as his stronghold’.

The number employed for the verbs in this verse is not consistent, unless the first Q reading is accepted; the plural verbs refer to ‘his sons’ and the singular verbs to ‘a multitude’.

11:12 לָבַב K supplies the consonants of a Qal imperfect לָבַב, literally ‘and his heart will be exalted’. Q supplies the vowels of a Qal perfect or participle, with Vav, לָבַב. The Q taken as perfect with Vav consecutive follows naturally from the previous verb.

11:18 וְלֶמֶשׁ K reads לֶמֶשׁ, ‘and he will return’ and Q has לֶמֶשׁ, ‘and he will set’, which makes the better sense.⁹

⁹ Cf BHS where CG reading והשׁוֹם is noted.
K suggests Qal or Piel infinitive (cf BHS), but the Masoretes seem to have indicated a Hiphil in Q. Perhaps a Hiphil, ולָךֲנָה, has contracted to the present text. GKC 53q considers it doubly anomalous.

11:39 K reads Hiphil perfect, which is not the correct narrative tense, but Q reads imperfect יִנָּה, which is an improvement, and according to BHS is supported by a Cairo Genizah reading.

Morphology

8:22 יִנָּה The prefixed Yod is very unusual for a third feminine plural imperfect form. It is listed in GKC 47k as an Aramaism which distinguishes the form from second feminine plural. Kutscher considered it a transition towards the replacing of the feminine plural forms by one common with the masculine plural. Two other examples of this anomalous third feminine plural morphology occur, in Gen 30:38 and 1 Sam 6:12, where Kutscher classed them as archaisms. However, it is strange that this verb follows so closely upon the earlier form יִנָּה.

9:2 יִנָּה Cf 8:5; Ezra 8:15; Neh 13:7. This form of יִנָּה is anomalous. It appears to be a composite of the Qal perfect יִנָּה and Hiphil perfect יִנָּה after the form of הר verbs. It is perhaps worth noting that the perfect of יִנָּה is rare in MT, the only other examples being in 10:1, where it is problematic, and Ps 139:2; the imperfect is the most common aspect of the Qal of יִנָּה found in MT. However, cf GKC 73a, Job 33:13 and Lam 3:58 for similar variation in a different root. The same semantic problem with this root as noted in Dan 8:5 may apply here.

This is usually understood to be a perfect tense of the root בִּינָן even though its form is that of an infinitive\(^{13}\) and it appears to be the only example in MT.

The form is Hitpael but חָכַן is not normally assimilated as here and Num 24:7. Cf GKC 54c.

This is a unique example of בֵּינָן in BH with an Aramaic plural ending.\(^{14}\)
There are several examples of Aramaic endings in MT; cf GKC 87e.

Aspects of the Hebrew that are Unique or Rare in MT

**Hapax Legomena in MT**

9:24 מּוֹט The use of מּוֹט is unique in MT.\(^{15}\)

9:25 מַרְדֹּן This word for ‘moat’ is now known from other ancient sources.\(^{16}\)

10:21 כְּשֶׁשָׁה The root is Aramaic: cf 5:24, 25; 6:9, 10, 11.

11:20 תְּנֵי means ‘ornament / adornment / splendour’. However, GKC 93 dd reads it as construct of תְּנֶה; cf BHS.

11:32 נֶלָה The plural is exceptional and it is unclear why the form differs from its synonym in vv 21, 34, unless it is a scribal error.

11:43 מִפְּנֵי The substantive מִפְּנֵי means ‘hiding place’ according to KB3, Vol 2, 580. The root is בֵּנָן.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{11}\) See below and pages 237, 240.

\(^{12}\) Cf page 39.

\(^{13}\) See KB3, Vol 1, 122; BDB 106.

\(^{14}\) This word is parsed in BW as a singular noun meaning ‘right side’!

\(^{15}\) Cf page 17 for the Niphal stem.

\(^{16}\) Collins, *Daniel*, 356 and notes 87, 88.
11:45 אָפָדָן KB3, Vol 1, 77-78, links this word to Persian apadana which means ‘treasury’. אָפָדָן אָפָדָן 18 is usually translated ‘tents of his pavilion’,19 but perhaps it refers to some sort of storage for the treasures of Egypt in v 43.

12:3 כֹּלַח is a hapax legomenon according to KB3, Vol 1, 265, of a root זָרָה, cognate with the Aramaic זָרָה to ‘shine’. See page 38 for the noun זָרָה.

Unique or Rare Verbal Stems

8:7 נָהֳדַר Cf 11:11. The Hitpalpel of נָהֳדַר is found only in Daniel.20 BDB, 600 gives the meaning ‘embitter himself’, but KB3, Vol 2, 638 supplies the sense ‘become furious’. GKC 55g lists this among 7 possible Hitpalpel examples in MT.

8:27 מֵאַשְׁחָה The Hitpolel of מֵאַשְׁחָה occurs additionally only in Qoh 7:16; Ps 143:4; Isa 59:16; 63:5. Here it means ‘I was dismayed’.

9:1 מָלָל Hophal of מָלָל 21 is unique and it would presumably mean ‘was made king’. A better sense is obtained by assuming it is Hiphil and a calque of the Aramaic Aphel stem, which can mean ‘(he) ruled, reigned’; cf BHS.

10:11 מִרְחֵי A Hiphil participle of מִרְחֵי occurs only elsewhere in Ezra 10:9. The asyndetic participle modifying a finite verb, מִרְחֵי, is unusual. Two finite verbs are normally employed, but here the participle is adverbial.

17 Hebrew הַנֵּכֶם according to BDB, 484, and both Hebrew and Aramaic according to Ja, Vol 1, 646, means to ‘be hidden / lie in ambush’. According to Sokoloff262, the Aramaic also means ‘to do something secretly’.
18 Cf BHS for the anomalous pointing of כָּלַח.
19 Montgomery, A Critical, 464; NRSV has ‘his palatial tents’.
20 It is attested in later Hebrew; cf Ja, Vol 2, 847; KB3, Vol 2, 638.
21 BW cites it as a Hophal under ‘Dictionary’, but in parsing it defines it as an Aramaic Hishtaphal!
11:6 The Hitpael of יָדַר is rare, found in finite form only here and 2 Chr 20:35. The sense in v 6 is ‘they will make an alliance’. In v 23 the infinitive is unique in form: in 2 Chr 20:37 it has a different morphology.

11:36 These are two rarely used stems in BH. The Hitpael of מַהֲרִי occurs only here and in Isa 33:10. The Hitpael of הֵרֵיל is employed in v 37, Isa 10:15 and Ezek 38:23.

11:40 מַהֲרִי is a unique Hitpael of מַהֲרִי. The Piel is used in 8:4 and otherwise five times in MT; cf Deut 33:17; 1 Kgs 22:11 // 2 Chr 18:10; Ezek 34:21; Ps 44:6.

12:4 The Polel form of שֹׁטְשָׁע is rare, found only five times in MT, cf Jer 5:1; Amos 8:12; Zech 4:10; 2 Chr 16:9.

12:10 This is a rare use of the Hitpael of בַּרְרָה, cf 2 Sam 22:27; Ps 18:27.

Expressions Unique to Daniel in Biblical Hebrew

8:1 The first person pronoun before a proper name in apposition, used for emphasis, has no parallel in a prophetic book, but it occurs seven times in MT of Daniel ( vv 15, 27; 9:2; 10:2, 7; 12:5).

22 It is defined as Piel in BW.
8:5 רוחַ is used as an absolute with קַרְן in the construct. The ending is characteristic of an abstract noun in both Aramaic and Hebrew. The meaning is not clear and it is often construed as ‘a conspicuous horn’; but the noun could be used adjectivally to mean ‘a visionary horn’, i.e. one that does not resemble a real horn. The word in Rabbinic Hebrew can mean ‘beauty’, which here would give the sense, ‘a beautiful horn’.

8:6 נְבָה דְחָא literally means ‘in the heat / anger of his power’, where ‘heat of his anger’ is the more usual idiom.

8:13 פֶּעַם is unique to Daniel, a contraction of פֶּעַם אָדָם וּרְשָׁעָה, Ruth 4:1; 1 Sam 21:3; 2 Kgs 6:8, meaning ‘so and so, someone’; cf BDB 811-812, KB3, Vol 3, 934.

8:14 אֲרֵבֶּב בַּקָּר These occur in Dan 8:26 with the addition of definite articles and a conjunction, which is more usual. The phrase indicates a whole day, which in Hebrew thinking begins at evening; cf Gen 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31.

8:16 נִיַּלְיָה is used as a demonstrative pronoun only here in MT but is common in Mishnaic Hebrew. It is found as an adjective in MT. Cf GKC 35 n.

8:19 לְמוּצֵעַ קֹּר כ Only Daniel has this expression for a pre-determined end time. המותעד, ‘appointed time’, is usually associated with feasts and festivals.

8:22 פַּכָּלִית This plural noun occurs only here in MT. The singular פַּכָּלִיתוֹ is used occasionally in earlier books, cf Num 24:7; 1 Sam 20:31, but it is characteristic of Esther and Chronicles, and it is found in Ezra and Nehemiah.

23 Ja, Vol 1, 442.
24 Cf pages 287-9.
8:25  **BDB 979** seems to equate this with כֶּֽפֶר הָצְבָּעָה, cf Josh 5:14-15; Gen 21:22, 32; 1 Sam 12:9, and with KB3, Vol 3, 1352 interprets it as a title of God.

8:24 נַכְשָׁהָ The participle would appear to be used adverbially, as in Job 27:5, but it is used uniquely with this verb; cf Dan 11:36. When used as a noun, it is normally associated with works of הָצְבָּעָה, cf e.g. Exod 3:20; Josh 3:5; Judg 6:13. There is precedent for use of the root מָלַך in a destructive context in Deut 28:59 where MT reads הָצְבָּעָה הָעַדְפֵּסָה, ‘and the LORD will make your plagues wonderful (exceptional)’. So the clause in Daniel may translate as ‘he will destroy exceptionally’, though its practical meaning is still obscure.

9:11 The Qal of נַכְשָׁהָ is used with עָלָה only here and in v 27. עָלָה with נַכְשָׁהָ in the Niphal occurs only once, in 2 Sam 21:10, the verb in total only 21 times in MT.

9:14 Weeks occurs ten times with preposition עָלָה according to BDB 1052. The idiom used with the noun עָלָה is unique: cf KB3 Vol 4, 1638, which supplies the meaning, ‘be concerned about’; but cf Jer 44:27, וַנִּנְגַּד שָׁפָר עַל עָלָה לְהוֹדֵעַ. The masculine plural is characteristic of Daniel, cf vv 25, 26; 10:2, 3. The only other occurrence in LBH, in 2 Chr 8:13, is feminine plural, referring to the Pentateuchal Feast of Weeks. This plural noun followed by a numeric adjective is found only here and vv 25-26. See GKC 121b for word order.

---

25 Thus BDB 810; KB3, Vol 3, 927, has the equivalent ‘dreadful’.
The article is problematic since the noun has not previously been introduced (unless in ch 8:12-13). הֲלָלָה is not usually found in the Piel: both BDB and KB3 refer the verb to חֲלָל. Q has the latter. Cf GKC 75 aa, rr.

K reads לֲחֵמָה תַּחְאֹת, ‘to seal’, but Q reads לְחֵמָה. ‘to complete’. Either phrase is unique to Daniel.26

Every phrase in 9:24c is unique except for, כְּרֵשׁ קְרֵשָׁה, which refers to the sanctuary; cf Ezek 45:3.

10:8 לְהַדוֹדֵי נָחַשׁ:" This idiom27 is difficult because ‘splendour / majesty / vigour’ does not provide an easy sense in context. Cf 1 Sam 4:19; Isa 60:5; Hos 11:8 for the same verb and preposition. See Dan 7:28 for the Aramaic equivalent דֹּרַידִי קֵשֶׁחַ נַעַלַי, of which the Hebrew may be a calque.28

10:15 נָחַת יִירֵי עֲרֶזֶה Cf 9:3, 10 for other uses of נָחַת.

11:1 לָמְחָה The Hiphil participle of לֶחֶם is used uniquely with ל and followed by ל whereas the usual sequel is ב. The sense is ‘for a strengthener / supporter for him’.

11:8 לְעַמְדָּה מַדְּלִים is used uniquely here to mean ‘withstand’. The verb is usually employed with מִמְּן in spatial / directional and, occasionally, temporal phrases.

11:10 לְהַמִּזְלָא לְרָבִים ‘A multitude of many forces’ suggests an excessively large army! The expression is unique; cf Ezek 38:15. לְרָבִים is the more

26 Cf BHS for לְדֵאָרָה; cf also page 34.
27 CI, Vol 2, 500 also cites 1QH 522.
frequent usage; cf vv 11, 13; Isa 16:14; 2 Chr 13:8; 20:2, 12, 15.

As it stands, this apparent use of the infinitive absolute of the following one of its finite forms is found elsewhere only in v 13, where an imperfect precedes it. In such a construction, the infinitive normally signifies continuation, giving the sense ‘he / it will go continually’, or perhaps ‘will keep on going’. Gib 101c, however, suggests it has the same meaning as when placed before the finite verb. An alternative would be to read ב, where the antecedent of the suffix must be carefully traced back in the text.

11:13 לָתָם קָנַתִּים is a unique temporal phrase which seems to be composed of previously used words and phrases; it is perhaps best translated, ‘at the end of / after some years’. Cf vv 6, 8; 8:27.

11:15 מָכְרֵת עֶרֶד מִכְּנָרָיו has a unique feminine plural form here, but a masculine plural in vv 24, 39 and twelve other occurrences in MT. The phrase is also unique in that, of the eighteen times the combination of these two nouns appears in MT, מָכְרֵת is plural only here; elsewhere the combination has the plural of עֶרֶד nine times. Cf e.g. 2 Chr 17:19; Jer 34:7.

מִכְּנָרָיו occurs in singular form in MT eleven times, but in plural only here. It is usually masculine but is feminine in Ezek 24:5. The phrase hovers without a finite verb so must be linked to the previous negative verb and translated ‘nor his elite (forces)’.

11:17 עַדְתֵּךְ נָעָשָׂה is a unique expression. In addition, as direct object of the verb, it lacks בַּא. 4QDan reads בַּא אֱנָשִׁים.29

11:22 וְדֵרְךָ תָּנָשָׂה Cf vv 6, 15, 31 for ‘armies’.

---

28 Cf page 74, where this clause cited in Zimmermann’s evidence.
30
Tin? means 'a leader of a covenant', or 'a covenantal leader'?

11:24 This phrase means literally 'with / in fat people / places of a province', and it is the antecedent of לָעוּ.

11:25 The sequence seems odd: the stirring of the mind would normally precede that of the power.

11:28 'A holy covenant' is an expression found only in Daniel, cf v 30 ( x 2 ). A definite concept referring to covenant in the Torah seems logical in context, whereas here it is indefinite.

11:29 This expression should perhaps be translated, 'like the former or like the latter'.

11:30 is a unique combination of verb and preposition. Noun יָצָה is used in Isa 10:25 and Ezek 21:36 with על, with the verbs לָעַל and שָׁנֵךְ respectively.

11:31 is not easy to translate: the historical allusion might suggest 'set up' or 'permit'. This noun and participle are found together only in Daniel, three times in all, but this occurrence is the least grammatically problematical; cf 9:27; 12:11. Note the lack of article on the participle in apposition to a definite noun; cf 8:13 and GKC 126 z.

11:32 The use of בֵּרִית רְשׁוּת with בֵּרִית as object is unique and, with the plural participle construct, it makes the phrase awkward to translate.

Cf vv 32, 33; 12:2, 3 for other plural participles construct.

29 Ulrich, 'Daniel', Pt 2, 22-4. The Aleph is fragmented but Ulrich is sure of this variant.
30 The phrase is used in 1QM 13.
Since the singular noun can take a plural verb, as e.g. in Exod 14:31; 15:24; 16:30 and the rest of this verse, it is probable that the participle is in apposition to יָם.

This participle construct is usually understood to be partitive, so the phrase means ‘wise men of (the) people, those of the people who are wise’, though the article is omitted, as often. However, root שביה can be transitive, with the meaning ‘teachers of, those who teach the people’ and the following clause suggests such an activity. Cf 12:3.

In each occurrence the plural participle seems to be used abverbially. Here the sense is probably ‘he will boast’.

A unique phrase as it stands. Cf 9:27 where the noun צֶבָּה is employed instead of the verb, and cf v 30; Isa 10:25; 26:20.

‘The desire of women’ is another unique term.

‘The god / God of fortresses’ is a unique expression. See GKC 117 n for the position before the finite verb. Note use of Lameds for the sign of the direct object in vv 38-39, which shows an Aramaic influence on syntax found on other occasions in MT; cf BDB 511-512.

---

31 Cl, Vol 1, 254 also cites MasShirShab 23.
32 See Ros 56, 182; T Muraoka, ‘Verbal Rection in Qumran Aramaic’, SQ4, 100-1.
means literally, ‘fortified cities of fortresses’. This tautology is another unique expression.

The phrase הַמָּיִם הַמְּעָרָכִים is unique. הַמָּיִם can be either a noun or an adjective, but the former is exclusively used adjectivally with construct nouns and both noun and adjective occur predominantly in phrases denoting ‘child / children’ or ‘foreign gods’. The latter is usually expressed by אֶלְּכַלְוָה סוֹרָה, cf Gen 35:2, 5; Josh 24:23, or אֶלְּכַלְוָה סוֹרָה, cf Josh 24:20; Jer 5:19. אֶלְּכַלְוָה occurs in Deut 32:12; Mal 2:11; Ps 81:10 where it parallels אֶלְּכַלְוָה סוֹרָה. (It is unclear why the writer alternated between terms אֶלְּכַלְוָה and אֶלְּכַלְוָה in vv 36-39.)

The preposition is awkward: the sense ‘with a strange god’ is difficult, and the first suspicion must be that its consonants really represent the noun בְּלֵי, which could be the subject of the verb עוֹשֶׂה.

רְחֵם יִשְׂרָאֵל ברֵכֵי is a unique clause. The Hiphil of נָשָׂא, ‘rule’, is rare, found only here, Job 25:2, and Ps 8:7, where it also carries a suffix. In Job it occurs as an infinitive absolute which functions as an abstract noun.

probably means ‘the chief / first of the Ammonites’ in the sense of ‘the cream’ of the people. Cf e.g. Ezek 20:40; Amos 6:1, 6.

The substantive usually occurs as singular and is plural only here in MT. The verb is masculine but the subject is feminine.

A similar phrase occurs in 2 Kgs 5:12 with הָדוֹר. Note also כ for ר. Though not an uncommon substitution, it is not usually found in יִסְדָה. Though not an uncommon substitution, it is not usually found in יִסְדָה.

presumably refers to the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea.
12:1 The nearest expression to this phrase is in 2 Sam 3:38 where Abner is described as "נָר שֵׁר הַנָּבָרָה".

12:2 This combination, "אַדְרַמְתִּי אֲחָמָאָה", is without precedent. The same nouns occur in reverse order, in Gen 2:7, "נָאוֹר مִטְאָרְאִים", but the usual expression is "אַדְרַמְתִּי נָאוֹר"; cf Gen 13:16; 28:14; Exod 8:12; 2 Chr 1:9; Amos 2:7; contrast Job 14:9. A similar phrase occurs in Isa 26:19, "שָׁכַבְתִּי נָאוֹר", but it lacks אַדְרַמְתִּי.

Note the retention of simple Sheva after the preposition on the participle; cf GKC 102b. It appears to have affected the pointing of the second syllable, which would normally be Sheva in a plural participle. Cf Isa 26:19, above.

12:3 "לֶחֶצֶת עַל לֶחֶצֶת" seems to be a unique expression, though "לֶחֶצֶת לֶחֶצֶת" is very common; it is used nearly a hundred times in the Psalms; cf especially the refrain in Ps 136.

12:7 Although the right and left hands are used in expressions of direction both literally and figuratively (as e.g. in turning from the way of the LORD in Deut 17:11), they are used only here in a literal reference to hands.

This is a unique juxtaposition of these two roots. Note also that
the infinitives appear to be used as nouns in the construct state.

Counting the two previous infinitives, there appears to be a chain of four constructs before בֵּית.

12:8 בֵּית appears literally, "What will be the end / end result of these things?"

12:11 לָלַח עָשַׁרֶת שָׁמָּה Cf 9:27; 11:31. Is this yet another possible example of the infinitive used as noun in the construct state? Gib 109b rem 2 classifies use of the infinitive here as nominal, in continuation of a preceding finite form.

12:13 הָלַח is used with ל only here: it is usually found with ב.

Rare Words and Expressions

8:26 לִכְחָמה יָכִים This is an unusual expression, cf Ezek 12:27.33

9:9 יַחֲשַׁב occurs only here, Ps 130:4 and Neh 9:17.

9:17 שָׁפָם as adjective is used only here and Jer 12:11, where it refers to the devastated land. Note the allusion to Jeremiah in the light of v 2.

9:24 רָעַת ( Q רָעַת ) means ‘sin / sin-offering’. This word occurs with Daghesh Forte elsewhere only in Exod 34:7 and Isa 5:18. The form without the Daghesh is more frequent, with eight occurrences in MT (Gen 20:9; Exod 32:21, 30, 31; 2 Kgs 17:21; Ps 32:1; 40:7; 109:7).

10:1 מַשְׁרַת נִבְדָּל ‘A great army’ does not make sense in context and neither does an

33 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 229, also cite an Ammonite late 7th century inscription.
abstract understanding of the noun such as ‘hard service’ (which anyway would be feminine), since the expression modifies הדבר.

10:2 This expression, literally ‘weeks, days’, is found elsewhere only in Ezek 45:21 where the feminine plural form is used. Cf 8:27 and Gib 41 d.

10:5 occurs only here and Jer 10:9, where it is connected with the precious metal, gold. For the latter, Jeremiah employs the common word בֵּין but Daniel uses the rarer בֵּין, which occurs eight other times in MT: Isa 13:12; Job 28:18 with פֵּאָה; Ps 45:10; Cant 5:11 פֵּאָה אֲדֻמֶּר; Cf 8:27 and Gib 41 d.

10:6 means ‘his feet’ or possibly ‘his legs’. Cf Ruth 3:4, 7, 8, 14, where it means ‘place of feet / feet’. The more usual noun, רֶם, is used in Ezek 1:7, singular and plural, possibly meaning ‘leg(s)’ rather than ‘foot / feet’.

This unusual expression is also found in Ezek 1:7.

10:11 occurs in MT only here and v 19. The plural noun תַּמְדֻיּות is cited nine times in MT and six of these are in Daniel 8-12: 9:23; 10:3; 11:38, 43. Cf also Gen 27:15; Ezra 8:27; 2 Chr 20:25.

10:14 This plural noun is rarely used definitely with the preposition ב. Other instances are Judg 17:10; 2 Sam 14:26; Ezek 22:14; Esth 9:26.

10:16 The idiom in 1 Sam 4:19 refers to a difficult childbirth!

11:1 ‘As a place of safety / fortress / protection for him’ reads oddly. The expression occurs in Nah 1:7 and Ps 31:3 and 4QDan supports MT.
11:4 פֶּן usually has the semantic range ‘after-part, end, future, result’. This is one of only five places where it appears to mean ‘posterity, descendant’, the others being Jer 31:17; Ps 37:37, 38; 109:13.

11:5 בֹּקֶשֶׁת means ‘dominion / ruler’ and is a rare substantive: it is found in v 5, and 1 Chr 26:6, where it is plural. Many would amend the latter, and if they are correct, the usage in Daniel is unique.

11:6 בָּהּ is the subject of the feminine verb. The idiom is met in 10:8, 16: it is found also in 1 Chr 29:14; 2 Chr 2:5; 13:20; 22:9. The verb means ‘restrain / retain’, but in this idiom always ‘retain’.

11:7 רוּחַ usually means ‘arm / power’, but, according to Cl, Vol 3, 136, in a few instances, mainly in Daniel, it seems to mean ‘army’: cf vv 15, 22, 31; Ezek 17:19. The definite article seems to indicate the army of the south.

11:8 וְכָלֹה means literally ‘the one who strengthens / holds her’. The Hiphil participle may refer to her husband. Cf Prov 3:18, where it is parallel to ‘to hold’.

11:9 This vague expression of time is made more specific in v 14 with a demonstrative adjective, as in 2 Chr 15:5. Cf Neh 13:31; Dan 12:1.

11:14 The noun כָּלֹה, which resembles an Aramaic past participle in form, is usually translated ‘violent one’, and only five other examples occur in MT; cf Isa 35:9; Jer 7:11; Ezek 7:22; 18:10; Ps 17:4. Cf Gib 36 c rem 4 for constructs.

34 Cl, Vol 2, 581 also cites IQH 3.
36 KB3, Vol 2, 596 records an amendment for 1 Chr 26:6. Cf BDB 606.
37

11:20  הַכְּכֶנֶם is an idiom found only in vv 21, 38; Gen 40:13; 41:13. Cf also v 7.

11:21  בְּחֵלֵבּוֹתָהּ See also vv 32, 34. This is a rare word, and a shorter form appears in v 32. Elsewhere it is found in Jer 23:12; Ps 35:6.

11:24  לַחְמִי בוֹדֵה This means literally ‘he will scatter to them’, and since בוֹדֵה is rare, the Qal occurring only here and a Piel in Ps 68:31, it is difficult to judge if it can carry the meaning ‘distribute’, which is what is required in this context.

11:26  הָעֹלִים is a Persian loan-word which occurs only here and in 1:8, 13, 15, 16. It is cognate with Sanskrit prati-bhaga, according to KB3, and can mean ‘portion for a king’, and those who eat it are ‘on the king’s payroll’.37

11:30  עַזְיֵים כַּתִים means ‘ships, Kittim’. עַזְיֵים occurs rarely with the meaning ‘ships’ only here, Num 24:24 and Ezek 30:9, plus an occurrence of the singular in Isa 33:21. It ought to be construct rather than in apposition to כַּתִים, and most EVV translate as such. As it is, כַּתִים could be either an adjective or an explanatory gloss.38

11:37  הַכְּכֶנֶם as a phrase occurs only here and 2 Chr 32:15.

11:38  צִעְרְךָ Cf vv 7, 20, 21.

11:42  לָא הַנֵּחַ בֶּלֶטִים The idiom occurs in Gen 32:9 and it means, according to

37 The phrase is A P Hayman’s based on Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 130.
KB3 Vol 3, 932, to ‘become a rescue’, i.e. to ‘escape’. This gives the sense here, ‘and Egypt will not escape’.

11:43 This rare word is found only elsewhere in Ps 37:23 and Prov 20:24.

12:1 The book is not specified, but the article suggests Daniel should understand the reference. Of all references where this noun is definite with the preposition ב, it is unmodified only here. In Deut 28:58; 29:19 and Jer 25:13 the demonstrative ה is added. More usually the noun is construct, as in the Pentateuchal expression בְּסֵפֶר הָדוֹרֶדְו.

12:2 This is used in the plural here and Ps 69:11, and construct in Ps 69:10. GKC 124e classifies it as plural of intensification, cf 9:23.

12:3 Cf 1:4; 11:33, 35: 12:10. The Hiphil plural participle of used as a substantive is found only in Daniel and 2 Chr 30:22. The singular is more common: it occurs e.g. as a substantive in Amos 5:13 and as an adjective is used to describe David in 1 Sam 18:14, 15.

This masculine plural participle occurs only here and Isa 5:23, though the Hiphil in general occurs twelve times in MT. The Hiphil participle singular occurs in Prov 17:15, meaning ‘he who justifies’.

12:6 This noun occurs in plural form only here, Ps 119:129 and Lam 1:9 (where it is masculine plural), but it occurs 13 times in all.

38 Charles, A Critical, 305.
39 BDB 812 lists מָלְטִית מְלָתִית in Dan 11:42 under the sense ‘escaped remnant’.
40 BDB 264. Cf page 24 for the verb.
12:11 הַפֹּלֶס This Hophal occurs only here and Lev 4:31, 35; 1 Sam 21:7; Isa 17:1. The form could be perfect or infinitive, and if the latter, it is possibly another example of an infinitive used as a noun in the construct state, cf v 7.

12:13 אוֹלַּי This noun is used with this preposition in 8:17; 11:6, 13; 12:13 (x 2); Hab 2:3; Neh 13:6; 2 Chr 18:2, but it is employed definitely without any modification only here, 12:13 and Hab 2:3.

Unusual or Unclear Semantics

8:5 אֲנָבֵי נְנִית הָכְבִּי appears in this context to mean ‘I was looking’, as in Ezra 8:15 and possibly Neh 13:7, but the root בני does not usually carry this meaning. It is probably a calque of the Aramaic expression משָׁהכָּלָה והָיוָה; cf 7:8.41

8:9 יִנְבּ, ‘the beauty / honour’, is usually taken as an elliptical expression with a noun understood, either זֶרֶק or זֶה, cf 11:16, 45 respectively. The term is often associated with the land, cf Jer 3:19; Ezek 20:6, 15.

8:12 כַּסְתַּי Cf 8:24, כַּסְתַּי, and also 11:17, 28, 30. It is unclear what meaning this verb carries when isolated in its own clause, or what information it adds to the narrative.

11:5 נִתְנָה הָלוֹא The first verb in v 5 means simply ‘will grow strong’. For the second verb in v 5 and the example in v 7, ‘and he will prevail’ makes better sense in the contexts: this meaning is characteristic of usage in Daniel and Chronicles.

11:20 לֹא כַּסְתַּי and אַף אִלָּמָה occur together uniquely. Cl Vol 1, 355 lists it as the noun meaning ‘anger’ with ב of instrument, but the Aramaic idiom means ‘not
openly / publicly’, and since this would be more suitable in context, the Hebrew is probably a calque of the Aramaic expression.

11:32 This is the sixth example whereヌשד appears as an isolated verb, but the meaning is less problematical: ‘they shall act’ ( because they are strong ).

11:33 is the standard verb in the BH idiom to ‘fall by the sword’, butヌשד is the verb uniquely here. It does occur in other contexts followed by עלי, cf Jer 31:9; Ezek 33:12. Since the verb here appears to be a synonym forヌפ, which in this idiom usually refers to death, it makes strange sense to fall also ‘by captivity and by spoil’. A less drastic meaning for the verb, such as ‘stumble’ seems to render it inappropriate for the first two agents, sword and flame. בותד occurs with ב in Esth 9:10 and a similar list, less only in Ezra 9:7, where its use seems appropriate.

11:35 similarly cannot mean ‘fall’ as in ‘die’ ( cf v 33 ) if the purpose is refinement ( purifying and making white ) of the wise. It must mean something nearer to ‘stumble’ or possibly ‘be brought down’; in either case the meaning does not seem quite right.

Unusual Grammar and Syntax

8:3 The numeral is used as the indefinite article ( so GKC 125 b ), though ‘a single ram’ would also make sense. This use of the numeral one is also found in Aramaic, cf Ros 46. Cf 10:5; 1 Sam 1:1.

8:5 Cf v 8; Ezra 6:17; 8:35; 2 Chr 29:21. is an Aramaism; cf 41

41 Cf page 88.
42 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 269.
43 Stefanovic, The Aramaic, 56, notes this usage in the Sefire Inscriptions and BA of Daniel.
v 21. The reason for the use of the article in this phrase is not clear, since, at the introduction of the goat, an indefinite expression is usual.

is not specific as to the subject, and it should read, in good Hebrew, as in note 5b in BHS, , with the third masculine singular suffix to agree with .

lacks as sign of possession and the clause must be translated, ‘the he-goat, a conspicuous (?) horn was between his eyes’.

8:8 The feminine plural subject of this verb is not supplied but the feminine numeral ‘four’ perhaps indicates that a plural noun has fallen out or should be understood. This may be , in which case the construct plural noun must have been lost.

8:9 A similar construction is found in Lev 4:2, without the article, and also in 1 Sam 17:36 without , similarly without the article. The phrase means literally ‘From the first of them’; thus Cl, Vol 1, 183, 5b; but is redundant and makes the style laborious. The masculine suffix has a feminine antecedent; cf GKC 135 o; Gib 1 d, rem 4.

The Mem as preposition is awkward, and the sense would be better without it, as ‘an insignificant horn came forth’. The preposition has the effect of appearing to set the word in apposition to the initial noun, but it lacks the article necessary to be in apposition to and would be misplaced in the sentence. BDB 578, 1 a, suggests the sense ‘from (being) a little one’.

8:11-13 This section is notoriously difficult, being subject to much emendation by scholars in attempts to make sense of it. These are some of the main difficulties:
v 11 There is reversion from feminine verbs to masculine in לֹּאֵל.

v 12 אֱלֹהִים is vague in meaning in context, being without the article. The general sense is difficult, as it is not clear what is the subject of the feminine verbs, and much of the vocabulary has such a broad range of meaning. אֱלֹהִים may be feminine, as in Isa 40:2, where it means ‘warfare / hard service’: this would provide the sense ‘warfare will be waged against the continual burnt offering through / by transgression’.

The jussive is used in וְיִשָּׁר without apparent reason; cf GKC 109 k; Gib 62 a; 85 c. In the second clause, רָצוֹן appears to be the subject of וְיִשָּׁר, but this would mean ‘truth casts down...’. The alternative meaning, ‘it will cast truth to the earth’, is an improvement, but opaque in reference. Cf v 24; 11:17, 28, 30 for root דָּעַש.

v 13 The first two clauses read clumsily due to the use of וְיִשָּׁר with שָׁעַר in apposition, since the former usually follows the noun as an adjective, even when it functions as an indefinite article; cf 8:3 וְיָדָעַל; 10:5 וַיִּאֶן. GKC 125 b understands the expression as ‘one, ( i.e. ) a holy one’ as opposed to another; cf Gibson 39 e.

The first noun would make better sense as a construct and therefore without the article; cf GKC 127f.

The phrase רַתְמָם has the participle in apposition to a definite noun but without the definite article, and the function of the infinitive is problematic ( where even GKC cannot account for it, cf 126z ), cf 11:31 רַתְמָם לְרַתְמָם לְרַתְמָם.

וְיִשָּׁר אֱלֹהִים לֶמֶנֶּה means ‘the sanctuary and the host a trampling place’, but
the lack of a verb has the effect of leaving the first noun stranded without connection to any other clause; GKC 154 a, note 1 b, translates ‘both the sanctuary and the host’. Clearly a clause may have a composite subject, cf Gib 24: since it is a nominal clause the verb could be understood as plural.

The expression in MT usually employs רזאכ (cf Ezek 1:6), so平板 is an Aramaism.

This preposition occurs with the Qal of אב only here and in Judg 19:14, where it describes the setting of the sun; Cl, Vol 1, 364. In the latter, it is not clear whether the preposition qualifies the verb אכלת נחמה or אכלת בראות Nä. It is found with a Hiphil of אב in 1 Chr 28:15. It is used in Dan 8:7 with אכלת, and in 10:13 with according, but with אכלת only here in MT; Cl, Vol 1, 363.

Cf v 5. The first term is an Aramaism. שעיר is more usual in classical Hebrew, and it may be a gloss here; but it could be translated ‘rough’ or ‘shaggy’; cf KB3, Vol 3, 1341.

This syntactic sequence of a participle bearing the definite article, followed by Vav consecutive, is difficult to unravel in terms of classical usage. The participle seems to be in a nominal clause in which the rise of the four horns is expressed in terms of an imperfect with Vav consecutive to show that it was sequential to the shattering of the single horn. Yet the sentence is complicated by the lack of a relative word preceding the second finite verb רארב מלבית מניה תומדנה. So ראית מלבית מניה תומדנה appears as a main clause, and הדגזרת והעדמה and הדגזרת והעדמה is not connected to it. Therefore GKC

44 Cl Vol 1, 364 cites 4Q251 3,13.
116w regards the participle as a mere catchphrase, ‘and as for that which was broken’.

8:25 is unconnected to either the preceding or the following clause. ‘prudence, insight’, seems to be used in a bad sense, but its meaning, along with ַע, is very difficult to construe.

8:27 Cf v 5. This is another statement where the subject is unclear. In context it might be taken as a general expression of ignorance among his associates, ‘no one understood’. However, the reader is not informed that he took others into his confidence. Cf Isa 57:1, Ezek 34:6, for similar syntax. Cf Cl, Vol 1, 214-216 and citations of the verbal noun with suffix.

9:1 There is no main verb in the first sentence: vv 1-2 are, in effect, one long sentence. The Masoretes supplied Soph Pasuq before the second reference to the regnal year, because such a formula usually marked a new thought and therefore the start of a new sentence. This has left the first temporal phrase hanging, with only a relative clause to qualify it. See also 8:1, where there is a possibility of no main verb in the introductory sentence.

9:13 is puzzling here. GKC 117 m lists its use for emphasis; cf also Gib 94 rem 6 for ָּ with subjects of intransitive and passive verbs.

9:18 See Jer 38:26, 42:9 for this idiom. The Hiphil participle functions as a present tense.

9:20 A lack of finite verb suggests the use of participles as main verbs, i.e. Aramaic syntax. It should be translated ‘I was still speaking and praying’, rather than

---

45 Montgomery, A Critical, 348.
46 Cl, Vol 1, 214 also cites 4QapPs ִּּ. 44.
like the temporal clause, ‘While I was still speaking’, in the following verse.

9:21 It is unclear who is the subject of the participle: Daniel is subject of the previous relative clause, and Gabriel of the participle which follows, and either could be subject of ‘weep’. Root הָעַֽיְנָה, ‘be weary’, or וֲהָעַֽיְנָה, ‘fly’, or both could provide the forms. רַעַת may be ‘wearied’, a Hophal participle of עָֽיְנָה, and could be בָּעַֽיְנָה, ‘weariness’, a tautological expression which is more likely to apply to Daniel than Gabriel. Could it describe Daniel’s state in 8:16-18 or v 27? Alternatively, the root וְהָעַֽיְנָה would yield the sense ‘flying with weariness’ or ‘flying with flight’. However, the Hophal participle of יָֽעִֽנָה is and if this is the correct participle, ‘flying’ must presumably describe Gabriel; but he is nowhere described as having wings, ( in contrast to בְּרֶפֶם of Isaiah 6 and בְּרֶפֶם of Ezekiel 1, 10).

9:23 See GKC 124 e for the ‘plural of amplification’, meaning here ‘greatly beloved’, and GKC 141 c for the substantive as predicate in the noun clause.

9:24 does not make sense as an additional direct object of the verb ‘seal up’. Should it read הָנֹֽבֵי, ‘prophecy’?

9:25 means ‘to build Jerusalem again’ but accusativa should precede ‘Jerusalem’. See GKC 120 e, Gib 97 b for consecutive tenses.

would read better with the addition of בַּרְבָּרָה, to give בַּרְבָּרָה שָׂרָה, though this may be understood.

The apposition gives the sense, ‘an anointed one, a leader’: the

47 Cf Gib 113 e. Additional clauses after the participle usually have finite verbs.
reverse is normal, e.g. Lev 4:3, 5, Lev 4:7. It may be conflation of two terms, but note Jer 20:1.

9:26 וַיֵּאָדֶם לֵלַע is vague and means literally, following an imperfect, ‘there will not be to him’ or ‘he will not have’: a complement is lacking. If לֵלַע means ‘nothing’ and the sense is ‘he will have nothing’, this is still imprecise in context.

This is separated from clauses on both sides by the conjunction. It appears to be a reference to the city of Jerusalem in v 25, and the Masoretes read it as part of the composite direct object in the clause following.

The overall sense of v 26b is very difficult. It appears that תְּהָרָה וִיקָדְם, joined by the conjunction, are direct objects of לֵיֶשֶׁר, but they lack נָכָה, though this seems to be a regular omission; cf e.g v 25. מִן must be the asyndetic subject but the whole phrase is strange, literally ‘a people of a leader, the coming one’. An extra article may be required to give the sense ‘the leader who is coming’; cf Gib 112, but note his rem 1 which gives instances in which a participle with definite article is used after an indefinite noun; Jer 27:3; Ezek 2:3; Ps 119:21.

The sense of the Niphal participle, construct in form, is difficult: commentators tend to read it as an adjective modifying בְּחֹלָה, but the form should end in He for this reading; cf v 27. It could be pointed plural to agree with גֵּדֵר, to give the meaning ‘desolations are decreed’. Cf v 27 below.

9:27 לָצֵל כִּבֵּית שָׁפָרָהְיָהוּ נְשָׁמָה This is a most difficult text. There is no main verb in the clause and the singular participle seems to be in apposition to ‘wing’. A

---

participle is elsewhere in apposition to the singular שְׁקָרָן (12:11). Since
is singular and ‘abominations’ is plural, it appears to be construct to
שִׁכְרֵים; but ‘wing of abominations’ is a unique phrase in the MT and its
meaning is obscure. The complete phrase could mean ‘upon / concerning an
appalling / desolating wing / corner of abominations / detestable things’!

This phrase does not appear to be attached to the following clause,
and if connected with the preceding phrase by the conjunction it suffers from
the same lack of a main verb.

The Niphal participle provides awkward sense, yet it is
plainly subject of the feminine verb following: a literal translation could be,
‘and what is determined will pour forth over an appalled / desolated one’.
Hartman considered that Isa 10:23 and 28:22 were copied by the writer, in
which case it is an example of a composite subject with a singular verb

10:1 Cf 2 Chr 9:5: this is a rare idiomatic use of קַדְמָה functioning as an
adjective: the nominal clause means literally ‘the word is trustworthiness’, i.e.
‘the word is trustworthy’.

10:3 An infinitive absolute followed by a negative is unusual but the
construction is known in classical usage: there are over 20 occurrences, e.g.
Exod 5:23; Num 14:18; Judg 1:28; 1 Kgs 3:27; Isa 30:19; Jer 8:12 and two in
Ezek 16:4; cf also Gib 101 b. Dan 10:3 seems to be the only example in LBH
and because שְׁאֵל is parallel to מַזְרַע it might be a noun meaning ‘oil’. Hartman
noted that it is the only example of the infinitive absolute זָרַע in MT, and
as a negative verb is always accompanied by שָנָם; cf Deut 28:40; Mic 6:15.

49 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 245.
50 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 262.
48

10:5

אֶלֶֽשֶׁת-חֲרוֹדָת would normally indicate ‘one man / a single individual’; cf Gen 42:11; Num 13:2; Judg 6:16. Less frequently it can equal the English idiom ‘a certain man’; cf 1 Sam 1:1; Judg 13:2; 1 Kgs 20:35; 22:8 // 2 Chr 18:7 8:3; GKC 125b. נֵאָלִיָּה אֵלַחַד אַיָּה may be used as an indefinite article; cf 8:5 רַדּוֹד אַיָּה; 8:13 אֵלַחַד קָדוֹשׁ.

11:1

It is unclear why ‘one who appeared human’ in 10:16, 18 should strengthen the ruler of Persia (assuming that was the role of this Darius), who was ranged against him in 10:13. Alternatively, was the ruler over Media, or does the initial Vav mark an antithesis?

11:2

The two different prepositions are difficult: two temporal phrases with the use of ב and the conjunction would be smoother, meaning ‘and when he is strong and when he is affluent’. Perhaps a temporal and a causal meaning is intended, ‘and when he is strong through his affluence...’.

אַלָּחַד בְּלֵס לֶמֶס לַמֵּלֶכֶת יִתְנָה translates as ‘the whole will stir up the kingdom of Greece’, which hardly makes sense. The meaning ‘he will stir up the whole kingdom of Greece’ would require הָאָלַחַד to be placed first in the objective phrase. It would make the definite article redundant, since the proper noun יִתְנָה would render it unnecessary in a chain of two constructs כָּל מֵלֶכֶת: the correct SBH would read הָאָלַחַד מֵלֶכֶת יִתְנָה.

11:4

אַלָּחַד מֵלֶכֶת-מַלְכֶּרֶם-אָלַחַד reads literally ‘and to others besides these’: the plural demonstrative pronoun has no antecedent unless it is ‘the four winds of heaven’, which makes no sense. Some reference to rulers of the divided kingdoms seems lacking, unless it is assumed to be implied.

11:5

אַלָּחַד-שְׁלֶיוֹת, ‘and some of his officers’, hangs between two conjunctions and the first part of the sentence translates ‘The king of the south will wax strong, and
some of his officers, and he will wax strong against him'. The first חיוֹרֵי may be in agreement with the first element of the composite subject; cf Gib 24 b.

וַיֹּאמֶר means ‘and he will prevail against him’. If the subject is the king of the south, there is no antecedent for the suffix on the preposition. If this king is the antecedent, the subject of the verb is unclear, unless the officers are the real subject and corruption has resulted in the loss of the plural verb. Alternatively, if the conjunction on the second חיוֹרֵי is taken as a dittography of the suffix on שֵׁרִים, the sense may be ‘(one) from his officers will prevail against him (and will rule)’. It is possible that דָּוִד was lost; cf 8:9; 11:23.

מָלָשָׁה, ‘his kingdom’, seems redundant following the satisfactory clause ‘and he shall rule a great dominion’. An alternative would be ‘and he will rule: his kingdom will be a great dominion’. The latter is supported by the disjunctive accent over משל.

11:6 לא יִכֹּלְדוּ שֵׁרִים seems to mean ‘and neither he nor his army will stand / remain’; with a composite subject of pronoun and noun, the pronoun should be expressed; cf Gib 24 c.

וַיֹּאמֶר means ‘the one who fathered her’, whereas a passive participle, ‘one whom she bore’, would make more sense in historical context. The participle is able to carry the definite article and a pronominal suffix, but to understand an allusion to the king of the south is difficult, and why refer to the father by such a periphrastic expression?

11:7 ‘From a shoot of her root’ is the literal sense, since a partitive meaning would be difficult; cf GKC 119 w note 2. The sense would improve

51 It was Berenice’s infant son who was killed, not her father, who died in Egypt later.
52 Cf page 322 and note 122.
if the preposition was attached to "נַעֲשֵׂה," as in Isa 11:1. נַעֲשֵׂה, a rare noun found only here and Isa 11:1; 14:19; 60:21, would then be the subject of רָעָם.

"וְכָנַן, 'his place' seems to lack preposition לָעָל. Cf vv 20, 21, 38.

וְרָעָם אל-כַּנָּן, 'and he will come to the army' is a strange and unique expression. לָעָל is used with this noun in Ps 84:8 in a phrase meaning 'from strength to strength', but there the noun is indeterminate.

It is difficult to find a meaning for this clause consisting of two very common words! The context lacks explicit description of what 'he will do in / with / against them', and at best it can be translated 'he will take action against them'.

11:9 Note the change of subject: it is apparently now the King of the North.

וְרָעָם אל-כַּנָּן means 'to his land / territory'. The noun usually occurs with the article in the sense 'the ground'. It is used often in Ezekiel instead of רָעָם; cf 12:19; 13:9: 37:12; and occurs with a suffix; cf Jer 42:12; Ezek 34:13; 36:24.

11:11 The phrase עַמּוֹר תֹּמְלַּחְתָּה תֹּמְלַּחְתָּה reads like a gloss needed to clarify the antecedent of the suffix in עַמּוֹר; but cf GKC 131 n, where it is classed as a permutation, a type of apposition. Gib 39 e, rem 3 lists the suffix in עַמּוֹר as an anticipatory pronoun, common in Aramaic; cf v 27.

וְרָעָם אל-כַּנָּן means 'and he will raise'. The subject of this verb could be the king of the south who is subject of the first verb in the sentence, or the king of the north, the direct antecedent to the verb.
Again the antecedent of the suffix is not clear, but is presumably the king who did not raise the great multitude.

11:15 The feminine plural noun has a masculine plural verb, just as in v 22. In v 31 the noun is given a rarer masculine plural form, as in Gen 49:24; 2 Kgs 9:24; Isa 51:5, so there is agreement with the verb. In Daniel, רָדַע indicates a military force; cf v 6 above; cf also vv 22, 31.

The lack of preposition ל with suffix to indicate who lacks power is comparable to the lack of suffix on the verbal noun in ch 8:5, 27. A smoother reading would be obtained with the addition ofナル or, more probably,Aleph. Cf 8:27.

11:16 The shortened form of the imperfect with Vav conjunctive is very unusual since it is normally preceded by Vav consecutive.

Cf v 15; 8:27

may mean ‘but he will cease / be finished by his (own) hand’; or a noun clause may be read to give the sense ‘destruction will be in his power’.

11:17 Another jussive form with Vav conjunctive and not Vav consecutive; but cf Num 24:19.

‘To destroy her’ makes poor sense in context; ‘to destroy him’ would be better, and this is the reading of 4QDan.

Gib 95 (a) notes lack of agreements where feminine or plural nouns govern third masculine singular verbs, but these are in passive constructions; cf 11:22. Neither do the constructions in Daniel conform to occasions where verbs come first; cf Gib 22:1; but they may be explicated by Gib 22:2a, i.e. construction ad sensum, ancient armies usually comprising men, not women.

Cf page 44.
is a difficult clause to construe. Perhaps the most obvious meaning, ‘but she will not be his’, is correct. The alternative is ‘but she will not be for him’.

11:18 The sign of the direct object is absent.

The term as a substantive means ‘cessation’ and as an adverb usually means a simple negative. With negative it means ‘except’ or ‘but rather’; cf Cl, Vol 2, 184. Here the phrase must belong in the second clause, because a preposition not should properly follow the verb , but this makes the first redundant in its clause, unless it is an error for .

11:20 provides another example of a Hiphil participle of . Its likely meaning in this context is ‘one who causes to pass through’, but it could also mean ‘one who causes to pass over / by / away, takes away’.

This participle occurs more frequently than ; cf Isa 9:3; 14:4; Zech 9:8; 10:4; Job 3:18; 39:7. ‘An exactor’ is taken as the meaning in this context.

Third plural verb for a passive is an Aramaic idiom; cf Ros 181. It also occurs in Hebrew; cf Gib 15 b.

means ‘and his army will overrun’. A better sense would be achieved if the verb was pointed Niphal, giving the sense ‘but his army will be overrun’.

56 Ibid.
57 See Ros 56, #181.
11:27 D'OVan Cf Gib 39 e rem 3 for the anticipatory suffix and cf v 11. It is probably best translated ‘those two kings’ to give the force of the article. is usually classed as a Hiphil participle, in pausal form, of הער, ‘be evil’. With the preposition (and the copula understood) it functions adjectivally to mean ‘for evil’. The whole clause means ‘These two kings will be intent on mischief’.58

58 BDB 949; KB3, Vol 3, 1270 does not list this word; it is regarded as a hypothetical hapax legomenon; cf Vol 2, 637; Cl, Vol 5, 490, refers to root רע.

11:29 The feminine verb and the sense of the clause require a feminine concept understood, as e.g. הָיָה, or the feminine is used in the impersonal sense of ‘the matter’. So the meaning is, ‘but it will not succeed...’.

11:30 To ‘forsake’ a covenant is an idea found in Deut 29:24; 1 Kgs 19:10, 14 and Jer 22:9. Cf v 28 for בֵּית הָעַבְדֵּי קְרֵשׁ. In MT בֵּית הָעַבְדֵּי קְרֵשׁ would be expected, to make the concept definite.

11:31 Cf vv 6, with comment; vv 15, 22 where רָעַת is used.

11:32 A plural participle as subject, מָרָשַׁעְיוֹ בֵּית הָעַבְדֵּי, would have a plural verb, but the singular verb indicates that the subject is ‘he’ and the participle is the indefinite direct object. דְּרֹפָּה usually means ‘pollute/profane’ and the Hiphil stem is transitive. ‘Corrupt’ would be a more appropriate idea in context.59

59 The same root in modern Hebrew carries the meaning ‘to flatter’.
The antecedent of the suffix might be the king of the north since the king of the south is the subject. Finding the antecedent for the suffix on the next preposition, מִלַּעֲלֹת, is problematic. Is it the reverse, the king of the north as subject and the king of the south the antecedent of the preposition, or is a different person the antecedent of both prepositions? The king of the north is presumably subject of the last three verbs of the verse.

**Indefinite Expressions of Time**

The temporal phrase occurs in 2 Chr 18:2, and Judg 11:39 where it is used with יָמִן. Here the phrase means ‘at the end of / after some / a few years’: contrast v 8 שָׁמַר שָׁמַר, 8:27 בְּנֵי בָּאָשׁ, common usages; cf 1 Kgs 17:7

Translates literally, ‘at the end of / after the times, years’.

The phrase occurs only here and in Gen 27:44; 29:20. It is unclear if it denotes an indeterminate time, a short time or both.

This temporal phrase hovers between two conjunctions. The position of Soph Pasuq attaches it to v 24, but it would make more sense attached to the beginning of v 25. Cf v 35; 12:4, 9 for similar phrases.

Cf v 35. This is translatable as ‘for there will yet be an end, at the appointed time’. The formula in v 35 is more straightforward.

Cf vv 24, 27; 8:19. This permutation of previous phrases might mean ‘until an end time, for it is yet for the appointed time’. It is, like others, attached unexpectedly at the end of the sentence.
Chapter Two

The Translation Theory of Frank Zimmermann

Expanding Evidence and Variable Headings

In his first article Zimmermann recognised that the question of whether the Hebrew of Daniel was a translation from Aramaic could not be settled by a priori judgment.⁴ He contended that all the Hebrew chapters, apart from the prayer in 9:4-19, were translation Hebrew and described the linguistic evidence which he felt clearly betrayed the Aramaic original behind the text. The evidence which he presented expanded with each subsequent article and his book.

The headings under which he worked varied somewhat from stage to stage. In 1938 he had six clear headings which were as follows:

A Idioms and constructions that betray an Aramaic origin
B Nouns with the definite article added superfluously or omitted where expected
C Illogical tense sequence
D Difficult or corrupt passages explained when retroverted to Aramaic
E Cases where the translator construed the Aramaic ungrammatically and without regard to syntax
F Misconstructions of the preposition ִ for accusative ִ, and vice versa

He added at the end one example, an Aramaic adverb mistaken for a noun, which comes under none of these headings.⁵

---

² Zimmermann, ‘The Aramaic’, 271; later this was added to Biblical Books, F, 27; see page 77.
In 1960, six reasons were put forward for understanding the Hebrew of Daniel to be translated from Aramaic, and these were likened to the same reasons used to deduce that books of the Apocrypha or pseudepigrapha are Hebrew or Aramaic in origin. They were:

a) usages
b) features of style belonging to one language and not to another
c) syntax possible in one language and not in another
d) idioms
e) stock translations
f) mistranslations

Zimmermann did not, for the most part, use these as clear headings for the evidence in his 1960 article, and so the reader is left to assign them where best.

In his book he used five of the headings from his 1938 article with some in differing order, but the 1938 section E is replaced with three sections:

C The copying of Aramaic locutions, not realising that the Hebrew and Aramaic go different ways

G Standard and stock phrases in Hebrew which convey the Aramaic meaning woodenly:

H Nuances of words (i.e. Aramaic words) that escape the translator

It is clear that in the nearly forty years which lay between his first articles and his book, Zimmermann underwent some change of mind as to the processes that produced what he regarded as a difficult, if not poor, translation from Aramaic to Hebrew. However the evidence remained for the most part constant and grew over the period. At this stage it will be described in full, including references to other
works, and as faithfully as possible, in order to show both the scope of the material on
which he built his thesis and the quality of the individual ‘building blocks’ of text on
which he relied. This is necessary, although there are too many items to allow all of
them to be analysed in full later in the study.

His 1975 headings have been used, but I have added subheadings in his section F
relating to the difference between semantic problems and those which seem to stem
from the misunderstanding of a written text. Zimmermann did not differentiate these,
but even at an early stage of this study it is apparent that it is an important distinction
to bear in mind. In other sections I have commented on these aspects as they arise
with individual items.

There was, of course, cross-fertilisation of ideas between Zimmermann and Ginsberg.
A number of Ginsberg’s reactions to Zimmermann’s views have been included, but
some larger sections of text where he radically differed from Zimmermann, as e.g.
Dan 8:12-14, are described in Chapter Three. The evidence of Ginsberg which
Zimmermann accepted is mostly indicated in that chapter as well.

Zimmermann’s Primary Evidence ( Under His Headings )

The following, unless otherwise indicated in a footnote, appear in Zimmermann’s
1938 and 1975 works. Full references for the items in his sections C - H are given in
a footnote at the end of each one.

A. Idioms and Constructions Suggesting an Aramaic Original

Aramaic Idioms & Constructions

$\text{אנהו דנייאל} = 7:15 \text{ אני יעהיאל}$
8:5  נָשְׂפָתֻל הָדוּח 7:8⁴
8:5, 8. נָשְׂפָתֻל הָדוּח = נָשְׂפָתֻל הָדוּח Ezra 6:17 instead of the usual cf Peshitta שֵׂפָתֻל הָדוּח
8:9  וְשָׁנָנְתָא וַתְּרֹב / וְרָבּוּ שָׁנָנְתָא cf Peshitta שֵׁנָנְתָא וַתְּרֹב
8:13  הָדְרֵשׁ הָדְרֵשׁ cf Peshitta מַדְרֶשׁ מַדְרֶשׁ, with numeral preceding,
8:22  הַטּוֹמֵנָה 3rd feminine plural imperfect Aramaic form⁶
8:25  רַעֲשִׁי יִד = 2:34 cf Peshitta אֲשֶׁר יִד
9:21  נֵבֶריעל word play in the Aramaic on נֵבֶריעל and נֵבֶריעל⁸

9:24, 25, 26; 10:2  נָשְׂפָתֻל The masculine plural form is classed ‘late’ but only the feminine plural form is found in Biblical and New Hebrew. Aramaic in the Vorlage influenced the translator to use masculine morphology in Hebrew. Ginsberg accepted this idea and noted a parallel in 11:31, דְּרִיעֵם.⁹

10:17  Aramaic form מִיָּה¹⁰
11:21, 24  בִּשְׁלָה, ‘suddenly’. Cf Aramaic and Syriac.¹¹

Actual Aramaic Words in the Text:

11:30  בִּרְכָּא Cf Montgomery.¹²
11:45  אַפּוּרִין is an aramaised Persian word according to Brockelmann.¹³

---

⁷ In Zimmermann, ‘The Aramaic’, 257, A, this phrase is listed erroneously as in 8:26.
⁹ Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 9, A; also 26, F; ‘Some Verses’, 350: Ginsberg, Studies, 48, (f); 81, note 24.
¹⁰ Zimmermann, ‘Some Verses’, 350 only.
More Aramaic constructions

All these expressions, except the one in 8:11, appear only in the 1975 lists.

8:11 לַחֲשׁוֹת זַבָּעָה עָטָב. The syntax, סֵפֶר וּלְתָנְכָּה and suffix first, is like דִּשְׁתָּמָן לָטָה יְנֵּא in Dan 3:29; 4:3; Ezra 7:13; 6:8. He suggested the original Aramaic was רְמִשָּׁה חָשָּׁה נַעֲרָו, noting מִתֶּרֶם נֵוַא means ‘take away’, not ‘take up’, (implying that רְמִשָּׁה was a calque of מִתֶּרֶם חָשָּׁה). He found evidence of a word play in Aramaic, נָהָרָא...נָהָרָא, translated as רְמִשָּׁה...רְמִשָּׁה in MT.

11:24 צְרִיָּה - עֵשֶׂת, reproduces E Aramaic, עֵשֶׂת אֲבֵן, ‘for a while’; cf PS p 400.

11:33 יֵאַבֶּד הַפֶּטַשׁ, be translated ‘for some time’ after Aramaic, והמת, cf PS p 190.

Zimmermann maintained these expressions were regarded as Aramaisms by commentators but he admitted that, in themselves, they did not constitute proof of a translation except in the light of his other evidence.

B Definite Article Added Superfluously or Omitted Where Expected

He noted that the definite article is sometimes used where it is not anticipated; at other times it is omitted where needed. This he contrasted with Standard Biblical Hebrew, in which the definite article is not used for the first occurrence of a noun, but

13 Brockelmann 40; A Kohut, Additmenta ad Librum Aruch Completum. 53b.
15 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 10.
16 Cf PS 534 and Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 10; the word play is explained fully in C, 15, and included in his chapter 3, ‘Idols in Daniel via the Aramaic’, p 42. The expression in 8:11 was listed first in ‘The Aramaic’, 257, A. Ginsberg emended this phrase for his retroversion; see Chapter Three, pages 97-8, 8. and note 3.
17 A misprint in Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 10, places this phrase in Dan 11:2.
for subsequent reference to the same noun, unless it refers to known phenomena as in e.g. Gen 1:1.

**The Definite Article Added Superfluously**

8:5 לֶחֶם-כְּנַצְוִי

8:13 יָתִיב לְמָמוּד The first noun appears to be construct with the definite article: he explained it as mistranslation of an Aramaic genitive phrase, as e.g. 5:5 בָּדְלָא רַבְּלָא וּמָתָא. 19 Ginsberg traced it to known phenomena as in e.g. 1:1.

8:19

9:24 לְכָשְׁתּוֹ

9:25 לְכָשָׁתָה

11:7 לְכָשָׁתָה

Ginsberg translated ‘his army’, assuming a third masculine plural pronominal suffix in Aramaic had been misread as נָרַס signifying the emphatic state. 22

11:13 לְכָשָׁתָה לְכָשְׁתּוֹ

11:17 לְכָשָׁתָה

Ginsberg followed Bevan’s suggestion that the Syriac idiom בִּתֶּן נָשִּים, ‘give in marriage’, should be understood, and retroverted the phrase to the Aramaic בַּרְרָדָה לְכָשָׁתֵי, ‘and his daughter [shall he give to him ] in marriage’. He suggested that the original Hebrew translation was נַשִּׂים בַּרְרָדָה of which MT is a corruption. Hence the clause should be read נַשִּׂים בַּרְרָדָה לְכָשָׁתֵי. 23

---

18 Erroneously attributed to Dan 8:15 in Zimmermann, ‘The Aramaic’, 257, A.
19 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 12 only.
20 Ginsberg, Studies, 52, 54.
21 See also Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 17, section D; cf page 68.
22 Ginsberg, Studies, 47 (b).
23 Ginsberg, Studies, 61, (12); Bevan, A Short Commentary, xii.
The Definite Article Missing When Expected

8:4 וְזֶה הֶזְיָה 27
8:14 יִרְבָּצֵק כָּלָשׁ The noun is mentioned in the previous verse. 28
8:22 מַגְרֵי, This should be ‘out of the nation’. 29
9:21 בְּכַלָּת עֲבוֹר, means ‘the time of the evening offering’.
9:25 לְמִדְרָשׁ קֹדֶשׁ is ‘from the going forth of the word’, but דָּבָר occurs in v 23.
9:26 בְּכַלָּת פֻּלִּית Cf v 25. 30
8:12 מִקְרָאָה means ‘the truth’; cf 10:21.
11:14 מָרָא means ‘the vision’.
11:21 מְלֵכָּה should be ‘the kingdom’ (x 2).
11:23 מֵחַנָּה תַּחִיתֵהוּ אֱלֹהִים, means ‘and after the league made with him’.
12:10 פְּלָשׁוֹת The wicked are mentioned previously in the verse.

24 See Ginsberg, Studies, 42-8, where a complex argument is expounded, and also Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 32, G, for his response; cf Chapter Three, pages 102-5.
25 Cf Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 39-41; see Chapter 3, pages 104-5; cf Ginsberg, Studies, 45, where he translated an appalling abomination; 48 (f) note f-f; cf 80-1, note 17 which is his response to Zimmermann’s general contention in section B concerning use of the definite article.
26 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 10 only.
28 The verb is discussed in Zimmermann Biblical Books, 22, F; ‘The Aramaic’, 261-2, D, cf page 73; also ‘Some Verses’, 351; cf Ginsberg, Studies, 41-2; cf page 98.
29 Ginsberg, Studies, 54, (2), has a different explanation for this word. See page 109.
The Right Construction Sometimes Used

8:3 קָאָלְלֵל v 6, 7

10:1 וָאֵחַ נָהְרָב...כְּהֵר

11:33 וַיִּשְׁפָּךְּלָּיָץ; v 35 וַיִּשְׁפָּךְּלָּיָץ

Zimmermann traced this phenomenon in the Hebrew to use of absolute and emphatic forms in Aramaic. He suggested the difference between them became blurred in Biblical Aramaic, just as in Syriac, where some nouns were never used in the absolute state. He gave the following examples from BA which might be tricky for a translator in this respect:

5:1 נָתַן = בְּנֵן but in v 2 = בְּנֵן

5:4 וְשֵׁבַע לֹאָלְלָה נִרְבֹּא וְכָפָא נִשְׁפָּךְּלָּיָץ. The materials in the list would have to be translated without the article.

5:5 וַיֵּלֶךְ בְּמִלָּה = דְּרִיבְּלָא דְּרִיבְּלָא

Zimmermann thought that a translator would need great skill to produce the correct Hebrew for these phrases.31 Ginsberg broadly agreed that use of the definite article in Hebrew Daniel pointed to a work of translation, but he thought that Zimmermann was applying the rules of English syntax to Hebrew. He suggested the translator may have used correctly Aramaic absolute and emphatic inflections, and Hebrew definite articles, in reading and speaking, but made slips in translation, having never been formally drilled in these usages!32

Zimmermann supplied an additional example of an ‘erroneous reading’ in 10:1.

---

30 This is mentioned in Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 26, F, as is also the next word in the list.
32 Ginsberg, ibid.
He pointed out that ‘the great river’ is a term reserved only for the Euphrates, noting this understanding in the Peshitta, and the fact that many scholars assume דָּוָּרָא רְבָּא and דָּוָּרָא הָדְקִיקָא is a gloss. He thought a Vorlage read דָּוָּרָא רְבָּא which in Hebrew should have been דָּוָּרָא רְבָּא. 33

C Copying Aramaic Locutions, Especially When the Hebrew and Aramaic are Identical

8:7 הַמַּמְפַּר הַמַּמְפַּר He said this meant ‘attacked, charged’; it was associated with מַמְּפַר ‘to contend’, Aramaic מַמֶּפֶר ( Pael ) ‘contend’, 34 cf 11:11, page 66.

8:9 מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא In 1939 he accepted Montgomery’s emendation, 35 מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא, after 7:8 מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא. 36 In 1960-61 and 1975, he rejected it as ‘strange’, though grammatically accurate. He preferred to suggest for מַמְּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא an underlying Aramaic מַמְּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא ‘from the small one’, since the Hebrew ‘almost’ represented a transliteration; thus he equated Aramaic מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא with Hebrew מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא; cf 7:8. 37 This understanding gave a continuity with מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא which described how the small horn grew. 38

Ginsberg thought it may be a feminine form of the indeclinable מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא, cf Gen 19:20, which was supposed to mean ‘younger’ or ‘youngest’, and he retroverted it and the preceding word to מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא מַמָּשַׁנְבָּלְתָא. 39

34 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 14, C, only.
35 Montgomery, A Critical, 333, after Bevan, A Short Commentary, 131.
38 See page 58, and note 5, and page 92 for Zimmermann’s treatment of these words.
39 Ginsberg, Studies, 82, note 32, and 53 for the retroversion.
There have been many emendations suggested for this troublesome word over more than a century.\(^{40}\) We only note here that Ewald suggested the pointing should be יְכְּפָּר. Hiphil feminine singular participle agreeing with יְכֵּס.\(^{41}\) This could be a calque of an Aramaic Aphel participle, since the cognate Aramaic root רֵעַ carries the sense ‘be small’ in both the Peal and Aphel stems according to Ja, Vol 1, 407, citing Targ O Exod 12:4. If Jastrow is correct, since the Aphel also means ‘reduce, do little’, a word play may have been intended. However Sperber does not record an Aphel in Exod 12:4,\(^{42}\) so if the meaning of the Aphel is limited to ‘reduce, do little’, this may be the intended ironic meaning in Daniel 8:9.\(^{43}\)

9:3 וַיִּפְקְדֵּשׁ הָאֱלֹהִים צָאֵב לְעַבְּדָם Ziimmermann said that ‘to seek prayer’ did not make sense, but a meaning ‘to apply myself to prayer, to pray’ was appropriate, so Aramaic would have read יְכֵּס הַנַּעֲחַת, ‘praying’. Aramaic científico means to ‘seek, ask for’, or, with cognate אָפָר, ‘to pray’. A Hebrew translator gave a literal rendering of the latter idiom, but יְכֵּס הַנַּעֲחַת would have been better; cf 1 Kgs 8:28, 29, 30.\(^{44}\)

Zimmermann was in fact showing the Hebrew in this expression was a calque of an Aramaic idiom.

\(^{40}\) See Montgomery, A Critical, 338-9.

\(^{41}\) Ewald, A Commentary, 320.

\(^{42}\) A Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic, Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts: Vol 1, The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos (1959, Leiden, E J Brill), 107. His reading in Exod 12:4 is יְכֵּס, with three Tiberian mss reading יְכֵּס, cf sigla vi-vii. A Berliner (ed.), Targum Onkelos (1884, Berlin, Gorzelancyzk), 72, has יְכֵּס, with one variant in his Noten, p 22, recorded as יְכֵּס: this is no doubt the basis for Jastrow’s lexicology, but it is dependent on a 1557 edition of V J Sabioneta. However, A Tal, The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch: A Critical Edition, Part 1 Genesis, Exodus (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Studies 6, 1980, Tel-Aviv, Tel-Aviv UP), 267-8, records a reading יְכֵּס, corrupted to יְכֵּס. B Grossfield, The Targum Onkelos to Exodus, Translated with Apparatus and Notes (The Aramaic Bible 7, 1988, Edinburgh, T & T Clark), 30 and note b, notes the differing meanings ‘become small’ and ‘be small’, but does not comment on the verb stems.

\(^{43}\) It would be ironic in that he, Antiochus IV, ‘reduced’ the Jews and did ‘little’ for them, and grew great at their expense.
He rejected Ehrlich’s emendation, הֶלְכוּת, for the lectio difficilior in MT. He provided underlying Aramaic הַלֵּךְ לֵלֶכָּה, and assumed the translator had difficulty in translating the copula, רֵית, so left it out. This Aramaic would have meant ‘And he shall be no more, he will die’; cf PS 15.

In his 1960 explanation, his retroversion to Aramaic was לָא יִתֵּנָה, ‘and he is no more’, and he thought the translator had perhaps tried to express the suffix in this Aramaic.

After noting the usual emendation of תְחִיָּה to תְחִירָה or to תְחִירָה after Cant 5:11, Zimmermann explained the phrase as miscopying or misreading of the Aramaic running text קָדָם תְחִירָה; cf Ja 1160.

He described as an ‘off-translation’ of the Aramaic root תְחִירָה, ‘be upright; correct, amend’, cf Brockelmann 838, קָדָם תְחִירָה to ‘adjust differences, make amends’.

Zimmermann, recognising the difficult sense of the active participle in context, traced it back to confusion in Aramaic of לְדוֹא (a fa‘ola form), ‘a parent, one who brings forth’ and לְדוֹא, ‘an infant, babe’; cf PS 192.

This vague term was attributed by him to the Aramaic לְדָו (or מָעָה, a contraction of מַדָּו), meaning ‘violence’, (in 1960-61 after Brockelman, 44 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 15-16; ‘The Aramaic’, 263, D.
45 Cf BHK.
46 Sic Zimmermann: he preferred the defective spelling for רֶית in his solutions.
47 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 13, C; also 26, F; ‘Hebrew’, 207.
48 Montgomery, A Critical, 408.
49 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 15, only.
50 Zimmermann, Biblical books, 13, only.
51 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 13-14 only; cf page 49; Ginsberg, Studies, 47, (a) note and 81,
535a), 'troubles, stress', comparing it to דמע (Prov 4:17) in the Peshitta. It was simply copied into Hebrew as 'times', the Aramaic not being understood.

Thus Zimmermann relied on 'evidence' of a translator reading a Hebraism in Aramaic!

This explanation is contra his 1938 account of בחות at where he rejected the reading of Marti52 et al who took it as part of the next verse, since this left the previous verb hanging. He said the verse 'demands' a word to describe the mishap or calamity that overtook the queen and her entourage. Zimmermann suggested a common synonym for 'time' in Syriac, כְּסִטּ (כְּסִטּ), and in support cited RH כַּלֶּכֶת (כַּלֶּכֶת), used with this sense in Esth. R. on i, 13 (referring to לְעַת of 1 Chr 12:32), and Pesik. Vayhi 99; cf Ja in situ. He appealed to Syriac כָּשתְת, which means 'mishap, evil, harm', as well as 'right time',53 used in the Peshitta for נְסֵּ֑ס; cf Gen 42:4; 44:29; Exod 21:22, 23. (In the NT Peshitta it occurs frequently for πολέμος; cf Mk 13:7; Mt 24:6.) Assuming 'the word had good Aramaic currency', he maintained the translator did not recognise the meaning 'evil, harm' and produced this lame translation.54

11:11 יָמִכֵּץ יִמָּלְכָּר Zimmermann rejected the meaning 'embittered, enraged' since he thought that 'rebel' would make better sense in the context of the territorial rivalries between the two kings. In Aramaic this would have been יָמִכֵּץ יִמָּלְכָּר, 'and he rebelled'. He noted its use for the following; יָמִכֵּץ יִמָּלְכָּר in Ezek 20:8; מָרָר in Num 17:25; מָרָר in Ezek 2:8; 6:1; Deut 31:27; 1 Sam 15:23. He suggested that the Hitpaal in Aramaic was transferred into Hebrew, although the stem in Hebrew has a different connotation. Cf 8:7, page 63.55

---

52 K Marti, Das Buch Daniel, 79.
53 PS 486.
54 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 14, and note 11; 'Hebrew', 201-2; 'The Aramaic, 267-8, D.
55 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 14; 'Hebrew', 201.
Zimmermann was suggesting another calque of an Aramaic stem in the above solution.

This is usually translated ‘( the king of the south ) shall push at him’, but Zimmermann maintained was only used for goring by an ox. He suggested the Aramaic was , where the verb means ‘wage war’ even without the noun ( after Levy Chaldaisches Wörterbuch on ). The Aramaic was probably and the translator chose the cognate Hebrew verb.

There seems little reason to object to ‘goring’ or the like as Zimmermann did, since it would be a metaphor from the animal world in keeping with the imagery of the visions.

D Misconstruction of Preposition ל for Accusative ל and Vice Versa

a. The Preposition Mistaken for Nota Accusativa

Zimmermann retroverted to Aramaic , ‘the word was true and very sure.’ He said the translator misunderstood ( cf Dan 7:16, 19 ) as a noun.

He also thought that could not be a verb since, if so, the form would be imperative, and a noun with pronoun was needed to parallel . He adduced Aramaic as the equivalent of and suggested the translator mistook as a verb when it was a noun; cf Ja 990.

Lamed in Aramaic should have been read as a preposition and not as the sign of
the accusative.\textsuperscript{57}

11:2 תרשיר תגלל את קלמהות ות. Zimmermann noted this was usually taken to refer to Xerxes, but said the Persian did not ‘stir up’ the Greeks but waged war against them. There being no ‘against’ in the text, he thought it should be translated, ‘and he will stir up all, namely the kingdom of Greece’. He posited Aramaic יוניר כלא לפלמהות וירה for the original that the translator misunderstood, taking Lamed as nota accusativa when preposition ל or לא should have been in the Hebrew.\textsuperscript{58}

b. Accusative ל Mistaken for the Preposition.

11:7 ובא לא יהלא. Zimmermann considered this clause meaningless retroverting it to Aramaic אוניל לוהלא, which he thought had been read as אוניל לוהלא, ‘he shall come to the army’, instead of the intended אוניל לוהלא, ‘he shall bring an army’. He said the noun in the emphatic state could be translated indefinitely.

Ginsberg followed Zimmermann’s lead, but he retroverted the noun to יהלא, translating ‘he shall bring his army’ and assuming that final יה had been read as a suffix of an emphatic form instead of a pronominal suffix.\textsuperscript{59}

**Examples of ‘Odd Grammar’ Included in Section D**

The following items were included in 1975 section D, although they did not fit under its heading and were introduced as examples of ‘odd grammar’.\textsuperscript{60} The first two references are further examples of semantic errors.


\textsuperscript{57} Zimmermann, *Biblical Books*, 17.


Zimmermann thought the expression ‘between his eyes’ bizarre but related it to the Aramaic for ‘forehead’; cf Onqelos in Exod 28:38 for Hebrew מַצָּרָה. He maintained this argument despite examples in Exod 13:16 and Deut 6:8, and parallels, of the phrase אֱלֹהֶים בָּאֹיְם מַצָּרָה, because, he argued, the proportion thirteen uses of בָּאֹיְם מַצָּרָה to six of בָּאֹיְם עִנְיוֹנָה in MT should really be thirteen to two, since two occurrences of the latter in Deuteronomy are parallels of Exodus, and the two in Daniel are translation!

Aside from the blatant circularity and ignoring of Pentateuchal evidence in his argument, it seems illogical to label an idiom acceptable in one Semitic language but bizarre in another!

Zimmermann recognised the difficulty of this phrase, ‘between the Ulai’ where the latter is a river. He linked it to Aramaic תָּאָרֶת, contracted to תָּאֶרֶת and later בָּא, meaning ‘between’ and also ‘place, area’. For examples he cited Onqelos in Gen 1:10, בָּא מַלְכֵּת הַמִּימוֹת, for MT לֹא מַלְכֵּת מִימוֹת, which has תָּאָרֶת, בָּא לַמֵּית, and A. Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, s.v. בָּא, which has תָּאָרֶת, בָּא מַרְאֶה, ‘at the Euphrates’, בָּא יָאוֹרָה, ‘at the rivers’. He asserted that a translator understood תָּאָרֶת to mean ‘between’ when it should have been taken to mean ‘at the Ulai’.

The following example seems to be an error in reading a written text.

Zimmermann read this usage as an Aramaism, contra commentators who cited Gen 27:15 and Dan 10:3 as support in BH. He claimed that תָּאָרֶת is used of things but not people,

---

62 Zimmermann, *Biblical Books*, 18-9; ‘Hebrew’, 206-7; contra Ewald, *A Commentary*, 259, who said the Ulai was the confluence of many rivers, so use of בָּא would be quite logical.
and though אֱלִישָׁע הַמָּרָדָה and אַרְיָת הַמָּרָדָה never are found in BH, הבורר תמר is never found in BH, but a similar idiom in Aramaic is permissible, as e.g. in Targ Ezek 23:6, 12, 23 where MT שלום המרדה הוא is rendered as אשון המרדה (Peshitta קסוי שולח רוית); Isa 32:12 where the Targum has קַפֵּלְיָה המרדה; Amos 5:11 where the Targum reads ברוכי המרדה (or ברכיו המרדה, Levy). He traced the examples in Daniel to Aramaic קָרֶם and then attributed three errors to the translator. Firstly, he made המרדה feminine: secondly, he misread the Aramaic as plural since the consonants are the same as a singular: thirdly, he read the Aramaic as Peil in form, making the Hebrew a passive participle. Similarly Zimmermann said that in 9:23 אֹֽהַּל should have been translated as מְלֹאór חַמְרָד / חַמְרָד אֵת, not as חַמְרָד אֵת / מְלֹאór חַמְרָד.64

E Disruptive and Illogical Temporal Sequences

This section treats all the same words and expressions as the 1938 section C, ‘Illogical Tense Sequence’ with some extra material.

8:5 זָמִיתוּ הַמָּרָדָה Zimmermann thought this usage bizarre, and better sense would have been achieved by employing זָמִיתוּ הַמָּרָדָה, cf v 21. He retroverted the clause to Aramaic כְּרֶם הַמָּרָדָה, ‘and the buck, a horn was seen between his eyes’. He suggested a translator read כְּרֶם as noun כְּרֶם, another form for כְּרֶם of rabbinic texts (cf Syriac כְּרֶם), instead of passive participle כְּרֶם, and took כְּרֶם to be construct, to produce ‘horn of vision’.65

Ginsberg agreed with Zimmermann but thought the translation ‘a horn was

63 Zimmermann cited Bevan, A Short Commentary, 153, for this point.
64 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 18; ‘Hebrew, 206.
65 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 21; ‘The Aramaic’, 268-9, E.
seen on its forehead' too weak for 'big horn' of vv 8, 21. He maintained that the passive participle should be given a gerundive sense of 'visible', i.e. 'stout'; cf 7:20.66

8:8 זמרancell הוהי ארבע זמרancell was of the opinion that even constructio ad sensum could not redeem the difficulty of the plural verb, and that was so awkward the sentence would be better without it. He posited Aramaic equivalent שלגא דרראת ארבא. He maintained a translator anticipated 'four' and took the verb to be third feminine plural perfect, בלב, instead of consonantal homograph, feminine singular participle בלבי, agreeing with as subject. The Aramaic narrative participle was correct and the translator should have rendered it by instead of יתגרן.

Ginsberg thought this account of the matter unlikely because Zimmermann assumed that the translator would know a feminine plural perfect form, which is Babylonian and targumic. He preferred to retrovert דבר to the same passive participle as in v 5 ( above ) but in the plural, ודניא, meaning 'visible / stout ones' ( in contrast to the 'little horn' in v 9 ) and agreeing in number with the verb.67

8:22 זמфессתית תדנומלדנה Whilst noting that the participle and Vav consecutive was taken by commentators and GKC 116w as casus pendens, Zimmermann suggested an underlying Aramaic ריד במקברת בלבי ארבא. He said a translator could have mistaken the participle as past tense for a present tense: translation into Hebrew should have been זה נשברת בלבי.

66 Ginsberg, Studies, 81, where note 29 refers to his section II, 17 and 71, note 47a, in which he translated in 7:20, 'and its stoutness surpassing that of its fellows'.
67 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 21; 'The Aramaic', 268, E; Ginsberg, Studies, 81-2, note 29 relating to 51.
Ginsberg agreed the definite article with participle, ידע השברת, went back to understood as a relative word instead of the ‘conjunction “that”’; cf 2:41, 43 רצי והוהי. He suggested Aramaic כְּבָה, was mistaken for passive participle פֶּלְּכָה and was rendered by the Niphal participle.68

This is a notable Aramaic syntactic influence upon the Hebrew, a possible form of calque.

10:9 זָמִירָא הָאָרְחָה נָכוֹם Zimmermann disagreed with Bevan’s suggestion69 that this clause should be understood as parenthetic and circumstantial, dependent upon the previous clause כְּבָהַשּׁא הַאֲלָה כָּבֵד שֶּׁרֵיה. He contrasted the ‘normal’ construction in 8:18, רַבְּכֵרָה שֶּׁרֵיה כְּבָהַשּׁא תַּלּוֹן, ‘and as he spoke with me, I fell on my face to the ground’, and said the clause in 10:9 could only mean ‘I had fallen on my face’. He posited an Aramaic text based on the Peshitta’s rendering of v 9, employing a temporal clause containing a participle and a main clause with a perfect: וְכִי שָׁמַע אֲנָה על מַלְוָדִי רָאָה דְמָכִיתת על אַנְפָּי. He thought a translator could have been misled by the change of tense, expecting the same tense in the main clause as in the temporal clause, i.e., another narrative participle; cf 3:7; 6:11. So a literal rendering was given in the Hebrew.70

Whilst Zimmermann preferred a narrative past tense in this passage, הָדִּיחַיָּה נָדוֹם makes sense describing Daniel’s state contingent with the voice speaking, but a consequence of his extreme weakness in v 8. Ginsberg, in contrast, found a problem with the semantics of נָדוֹם.71

---

68 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 19-20; ‘The Aramaic’, 259-60; Ginsberg, Studies, 42.
69 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 167.
71 See Ginsberg’s comments on נָדוֹם in 8:18; cf Chapter Three, pages 108-9.
Zimmermann did not differentiate in this section between semantic misunderstandings or borrowings, which are in fact examples of calque, and those involving a written text. The subdivisions to this effect are mine.

Semantic Misunderstandings

8:14 $\text{שָׁנַחַרְתָּךְ}$ Zimmermann did not think ‘justified’ a suitable translation for the Niphal verb, nor Bevan’s ‘vindicated’.

He adduced Aramaic retroversion $אָשָׁר$ (cf Syriac $אָשָׁר$) since the Targums and Peshitta usually render $יְהִיּוּ$ by $דָּרֵךְ$ or $דָּרָם$, e.g. Targs Job 33:12; Deut 25:1; and also $יְפָרֵב$, Jer 25:29, and $יְבָשַׁר$, Job 33:9. He argued that Aramaic root $דָּרֵךְ$ has two meanings, i) ‘to justify’, ii) ‘to cleanse, purify. So, either the translator read the first when the second was correct, or, roots $דָּרָם$ and $דָּרָם$ ‘purify, cleanse’, were confused.

Ginsberg thought the latter was the case, and that only a translator could have produced $דָּרָם$. Yet he took issue with Zimmermann’s assertion that both $דָּרָם$ and $דָּרָם$ can mean either ‘be righteous, victorious’ or ‘be pure, (ritually) clean’. He argued only $דָּרָם$ covers the senses ‘be righteous, victorious’, and $דָּרָם$ ‘be pure, clean’. He retroverted to $יְזָרֵבָה / אָשָׁר$ translating ‘will be clean’.

Zimmermann answered this criticism by re-asserting $דָּרָם$ and $דָּרָם$ to be synonyms, appealing to Brockelmann 153, 196 where purgavit is cited as a meaning for both roots, to Targ Job 9:30; 15:14, where they are interchanged, and to Ja, Vol 1, 307, 399 for support. He translated ‘the sanctuary shall be cleansed’, referring to Dan 11:31; 1 Macc 46:47; Jos Ant XII, 5.4 which

---

tell of swine sacrificed in the Temple, and LXX 8:14 καὶ καθαρίσθησεται.73

9:21 ἢπαταὶ διστὰς He thought this odd phrase could possibly be translated ‘being caused to fly swiftly’, though he wondered why a passive participle was used, what ‘being caused to fly’ meant, why Gabriel was ‘caused’, and how ‘swiftly’ is supposed to come from ἄλογον, ‘fly’. For Aramaic solutions he adduced ἄλογον, ‘enveloped in a covering’, or ἄλογον ἄλογον, ‘covered with a veil’; cf Ja, Vol 2, 1073; PS 406, 421; Dalman Gram 333, 335. A translator did not recognise the passive participle of ἄλογον and assumed it meant ‘fly’, and the Pual was used because ἄλογον was thought to mean ‘hasten’.74

10:8 τοῦ πνεύματος ἐλεημοσύνης Zimmermann recognised this phrase corresponded to Aramaic יֹבָליָכָל יָכִי יָשָׁב of 7:28 (5:9), and though he was often translated ‘comeliness’ here, he said its meaning was ‘glory, majesty’. He pointed out that Aramaic יֹבָליָכָל (and Hebrew יָכִי) had two meanings; i) ‘glory, splendour’, and ii) ‘brightness of features, countenance’. So he inferred the translator garnered the wrong meaning, using יֹבָליָכָל instead of יָכִי.75

Ginsberg agreed with Zimmerman, though he thought that Aramaic יָכִי could not mean ‘countenance’. He admitted that the error could have been made by an author who thought in Aramaic, and not only by a translator.76

This clause is a good example of a calque.

10:10 ἔλθεν ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ Zimmermann disliked the meaning ‘and moved me’ for the verb since the context required the sense ‘lifted me up’. He noted

---

74 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 29-30 only.
76 Ginsberg, Studies, 41; 79, note 4.
that לְטַעֵל is used in targums for ‘move’ but it also meant ‘lift up’, citing Yer. Hag. II 77d, ‘and shall lift her (the witch) off the ground’, and Ja 536 for other examples. He argued that לְטַעֵל was used in an Aramaic Vorlage and the translator should have understood the second meaning, rendering by רָזֶה or רָזֶה. 77

The sense ‘and caused me to move onto all fours’ does not seem unreasonable, although ‘lifted me onto all fours’ would be more precise.

11:2 הרִבְכָּרוּי נֵעַשֵּׁר. Usually translated, ‘and the fourth shall be far richer than them all; and when he is waxed strong through his riches’, should be understood as referring to the great forces of Xerxes or Darius; cf vv 10, 11, 13, 15. Zimmermann thought the wealth of the king, irrelevant. Since Aramaic לָהֵ֣לי, ‘army’, means the same as Hebrew לָהֵ֣לי, which also means ‘riches’, he said a bilingual translator misconstrued the entire verse. He retroverted MT into Aramaic as רֵבִיתִא הוֹיָל וַהֲנָא מְכַלָּא וַכּלָּא and assumed a translator made these errors:

a) ‘He shall gather / marshal a great army’ was mistranslated ‘he shall become very rich’; the Hebrew should have read וְרַבְרֶבֶנָה יִצָּבַּא זְבֵצָת נַבְרָא (רֵבֵּר מְכַל) b) ‘. . . when he shall become powerful in his forces’ was misread as ‘he shall become strong (?) in his riches’; the Hebrew should have been . . . רוֹךְ רוֹךְ (רְבִּרְכָּרוּי) .

Zimmermann elaborated on this, arguing the translator’s use of the various meanings of לָהֵ֣לי such as ‘wealth, strength, army’ in ch 11 showed he knew the noun, but was uncertain which sense should be used in a given place, and so employed both לָהֵ֣לי and לָהֵ֣לי. 78

Zimmermann seems to have adduced a Hebrew calque of an Aramaic root: Hebrew יחל, ‘be rich’, read into Aramaic verb and nouns of root בחל. In addition, his objection to the concept of great wealth is weak, since it was usually associated with power because it bought armies.

11:18 וְהֲשַׁפֵּעַ Although the verse may be interpreted in the context of the dealings of Scipio with Antiochus, Zimmermann considered this verb difficult and thought the sense would be smoother if Aramaic בשלום was assumed to underlie the verb, since it is often the equivalent of בשלום in targums. The Aramaic verb can mean ‘stop, interrupt, discontinue; give judgment, pass sentence, umpire; assign, apportion, argue’. Taking the reading בדל, from לדל ‘curse, swear an oath’ in Aramaic, for after Montgomery et al. Zimmermann translated the verse, ‘The general will inflict humiliation upon him with an oath; his humiliation will he turn back on him’ (again פספספ). Use of בשלום is awkward, but בשלום hardly seems an improvement, and Zimmermann had to resort to emendation as well. Many scholars assume the last clause is a gloss.

11:23 וַיֶּלֶךְ דַּחַר He found this expression, ‘with a few people’, strange and argued the Hebrew words דָּעַר and דַּחַר both mean ‘nation’, whilst only דָּעַר is used of the people constituent of a nation. Then he said that since Aramaic דָּעַר means both ‘nation’ and ‘people’ it must underlie the Hebrew and a translator understood the first meaning.

---

79 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 30 added to the semantic range of בשלום idioms such as ‘agreement to assigning of money to a son-in-law’, Mish. Ketu. 16.2; ‘contend, argue with God’, Sanh. 44b used of the angel Gabriel, meaning literally, ‘give cutting words levelled against God’.
80 Montgomery, A Critical, 444 (also after the Greek); H L Ginsberg, JAOS 59, 105, citing ZAW (1939).140; and A Bentzen, Daniel (HAT 19, 1952, Tubingen, Mohr), 80 for above references.
81 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 30-1.
Ginsberg accepted this explanation, and דב would certainly read better than דב.

11:35 בחיל לחרות במכות. Cf v 33. Zimmermann approached the difficulty in this clause by using the Aramaic equivalent to חיל, which means ‘stumble, fall’ and its homonym, root be weighed’. The sense of the second root should be understood and the Aramaic equivalent to the passive would be דב.

Similarly in v 33, since they cannot ‘fall by captivity and by spoil’, he assumed mistranslation of the same Aramaic, דב the original indicating weighing in order to test them.

Ginsberg agreed with this explanation and argued that this error could not have been made by an author, who would have known what he had in mind. He noted that the Hebrew for ‘weigh’ was דב and not חיל.

It is true that חיל does not seem to match well the idea of refinement by adversity, but דב, ‘weigh’, is not a great improvement, involving a mixed metaphor.

12:2 אֲחָמָה תֶּשֶׁר. For this odd combination of nouns, because דב was frequently replaced by יָרֵע in targums, Zimmermann suggested absolute יָרֵע lay behind דב. Since יָרֵע was not only a noun, ‘ground, earth’, but also an adverb, ‘under, beneath’, he said the Hebrew should have had the sense ‘those who sleep beneath the dust’. He thought use of יָרֵע in targums and other Jewish Aramaic may have influenced the translator’s anticipation here.

---

84 Cf page 40.
Zimmermann consistently attributed to the translator the error of understanding the semantic range of the Aramaic but choosing the wrong meaning for the context and turning this into Hebrew. He did not attempt to explain why the translator made such inept choices. Had he done so, it might have occurred to him, it was more probable that the writer misunderstood the semantic range of the Hebrew words, and was in fact imputing to them the range of meaning in the Aramaic. In the example in 11:35, Ginsberg also showed that he did not consider this alternative. These semantic errors, or borrowings, are a type of calque, a phenomenon that is not restricted to the work of translation. Semantic errors, if they are such, can be made in speech and composition as well, by anyone who thinks in one language and is trying to express something in another in which their competence is not great.

Written Text

8:23 עָדוֹנֵי יָמָיו מָכִיר זְיָרָהוֹת Zimmermann objected to the usual translation ‘a king, fierce of countenance, and understanding stratagems’ because יָיוְדָהוֹת means ‘riddles’, and this meaning did not connect with the first characteristic of the king as ‘fierce of countenance’ or ‘hard-faced’. He retroverted יָיוְדָהוֹת to Aramaic יָיוְדָהוֹת, which he suggested a translator took to be plural absolute of אֲרוֹדָה אֲרוֹדָה ‘riddle’, instead of absolute singular of אֲרוֹדָה אֲרוֹדָה, ‘power’. So the Aramaic read מַשְׁתֵּל אֲרוֹדָה, ‘crafty in power’, which was an appropriate description of Antiochus and an apt sequel to וְיִנָּה.87

9:26 הַפְּרִי He thought this word seemed misplaced because it anticipated the fall of Antiochus when he was still active in the next verse. He suggested the Aramaic was פֶּרֶש, which should have been understood as ‘his sword’ rather than ‘his end’, so that the meaning was, ‘his sword (metonymy for his army) shall keep rushing on’.88

87 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 26; ‘Hebrew’, 207.
88 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 26-7; ‘Hebrew’, 207.
Zimmermann noted this unique expression in MT, and, assuming a reference to a Jewish covenant, objected that Antiochus IV did not ‘strengthen the covenant’ but ‘profaned’ it. However, he acknowledged the Versions’ support for MT. He retroverted the clause to הָדַלְת הָתוֹך, with Haphel imperfect of הָדַלְת, to give the sense ‘he shall profane the covenant’. He thought the translator had read יַשִּׁמֵם, Pael imperfect of יָשִׁמֶנ, ‘he shall strengthen’, because יָשִׁמֶנ is used in targums frequently for הָדַלְת and הב: the spelling was the targumic plene, הָדַלְת from הָדַלְת, and the translator could have read consonantal Yod instead of a vowel letter.

Ginsberg considered this argument improbable because Zimmermann posited use of מָשַׁמֵם instead of מָשַׁמֵם in his Aramaic for ‘profane’. 89

Here Zimmermann rejected the emendation מָשַׁמֵם because it lacked a verb such as ‘set’. For an Aramaic equivalent of מָשַׁמֵם he suggested מִשְׁמָך, which should have been read as מִשְׁמָך, יַשִּׁמֵם, ‘there shall come the blasphemy of’, from root יַשִּׁמַּה and מַשִּׁמַּה, ‘blasphemy’. It was misread as יִשְׁמָך יִשְׁמָך ‘and upon a wing of’.

Ginsberg preferred מָשַׁמֵם, with the antecedent, ‘sacrifice and offering’. 91

Zimmermann could not make sense of this phrase, retroverting it to מְדַנְדֶד מַשִּׁמַּה מֲלָכָה after Targ Zech 9:8, Dan 7:14 מַשִּׁמַּה מֲלָכָה, and use of מְדַנְדֶד in Daniel for ‘taking away’ of dominion. He argued that a translator misinterpreted מַשִּׁמַּה as ‘exactor, ruler’ instead of

89 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 22-3; ‘The Aramaic’, 263-4, D; Ginsberg, Studies, 84, note 57 (where read 263-4 for 260-1). Cf p 54 and back references, for his ideas on ‘profane’ in 8:11, 13; (11:31); 12:7, and on ‘saints’; cf Chapter Three, pages 98, 102-4.
90 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 160, apparently after Kuenen.
91 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 23-4; ‘The Aramaic’, 264-5, D; Ginsberg, Studies, 80, note 15b
‘dominion, sovereignty’, and that it should have been understood with המלך in apposition. It meant ‘one who will cause sovereignty and royal majesty to pass away’, the lack of conjunction being idiomatic Aramaic.

Ginsberg mostly agreed with this solution, but retroverted to מזדוות rather than מזדוות, from a hypothetical מזדוות, as he considered Zimmermann’s spelling of the past participle improbable. He interpreted it as referring to Seleucus’ lack of ‘dominion, glory and sovereignty’, and suggested the Peshitta had the same word from which תונש was translated under the influence of 7:14, and not because it carried the sense ‘potentate’ here. His improved rendering of the Hebrew was the post-biblical תונש (משלי) שלטונש חזר חזר ונלכדת.\(^{92}\)

### G Standard and Stock Translations which Conveyed Wooden and Misleading Renditions of Aramaic

8:8 **ןָכָּכַּמְּךָ יָשָׁבְךָ**  
Cf 11:4. Zimmermann found a non-sequitur in the sense, ‘And as he was strong, it was broken’, for, if the great horn, i.e. Alexander, became strong, his being broken would not be an immediate consequence. He preferred the sense ‘he fell away / died’ after Hitzig, who suggested a Hebrew root "עֶנֶר for הכָּנִמְרָד in 11:4 on the basis of the Arabic for ‘he died’. Zimmermann thought הכיר חסן was an infinitive (cf 6:21), or הכיר חסן, ‘when he became mortally weak / ill / sick unto death’, was the Aramaic behind הככָּמֶךָ. He noted that הכיר, ‘be strong’, can also mean ‘be mortally sick’, but the translator understood the former instead of the latter. He even saw a possible word play in Aramaic הכָּכָּמֶךָ on the sudden death of Alexander. He appealed to Peshitta usages for 2 Sam 12:15 and Isa 39:1, and pre-empted any complaint of mixed metaphors in the ‘horn’ becoming ‘ill’ by

---

suggesting a rendering of the verb as ‘gave way, collapsed’.  

This is an attractive idea, since ‘be mortally sick’ would precisely describe what happened to Alexander. However, that his death took place at the height of his power is surely the intended allusion in this instance.

8:17, 18  

This is an attractive idea, since ‘be mortally sick’ would precisely describe what happened to Alexander. However, that his death took place at the height of his power is surely the intended allusion in this instance.

8:17, 18  See 10:11 below, and note 96.

8:23  Zimmermann accepted the reading מְכַסֶּהַ הַפִּשְׁעִני after LXX, Θ, S. Hebrew כָּסַה means ‘be complete, finished, cease’, the targumic and Peshitta equivalent being often שלם. The Aramaic verb means

i) ‘be complete’, and ii) ‘fill, fill up’, as e.g. Targ Exod 28:17; 39:10; 31:15. He said the translator must have taken the sense to be i), instead of ii) intended by the author.  

What he suggested is another example of calque, but misunderstanding of Hebrew בֶּפֶשֶׁנִים is also involved.

9:24  אַלַּחֲתָהוּ חֹזֵי לְגָנִים Here Zimmermann objected to the idea of sealing up the vision, in this context, because he thought it conflicted with the notion of a bright future in which vision and prophecy ‘would not be out of place’. He saw שלם, ‘fulfill’, as the underlying Aramaic, the meaning required being that prophetic vision will be fulfilled. It then followed, in his view, that the masoretic note, לְחֹזֵי מִלְחָתָה applied to the first לְחֹזֵי מִלְחָתָה in the verse, should also be applied here, for LXX, Θ, Peshitta and Vulgate all supported this reading. He conjectured that there may even have been two masoretic notes reduced to one in this verse.  

---

93 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 35-6, only.

94 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 31; ‘The Aramaic’, 262-3, D.

Zimmermann appealed to the same calque as in 8:23 (above), but it is dependent on the textual note he applied.

10:11 Cf 8:17, 18. He thought the Aramaic equivalent for ‘feet’ in some contexts, קָפָיָן, was the basis for זֶרֶם. In support he quoted the American translation ‘Stand on your feet’, and appealed to Ezek 2:1; 3:24; Brockelmann, Lexicon 654, pes (hominis), and the expressions קָפָיָן רָכָלָא, בֵּ &[א]סְיָנָרָנ. He found other examples in LBH, e.g. Neh 9:3 יַדָּם עֶלֶה, הוא עֶמֶד, and נְכָבָר עֶלֶה עֶמֶד in 2 Chr 30:16 and elsewhere.96

This is at best a calque from Aramaic, but if the idiom was well established in Hebrew, it is hardly a basis for adducing a translation from Aramaic.

11:4 ובָּאֲתַר הָעָנָם תָּכַב עַל חַד הָעָנָם, For the difficult sense of וְבָּאֲתַר הָעָנָם, ‘and when he shall stand up’, Zimmermann preferred ובָּאֲתַר, ‘when he shall totter’; cf Ps 26:1.97

וְאַלְכִּי בָּאֲתַר הָעָנָם. He found this phrase, ‘not to his posterity’, placed ineptly where a parallel to כּסְפָיָן would be required. In 1939 he noted the ‘remarkable’ readings in LXX and Peshitta providing the correct parallel to כּסְפָיָן, and he put forward two alternatives for a solution, the second being the simplest. This seems to have been prompted by the Peshitta’s מַסְמַרְשְׁמַר, ‘not as his sword’ for he suggested the Aramaic read מַסְמַר שְׁמַרְשְׁמַר and this was taken to mean ‘his sword’, when it was in fact ‘his sword’. The Hebrew should therefore have been כּסְפָיָן.

His first, more complex solution was based on the LXX reading אוּ וְאָלַת מַסְמַר אָלַת מַסְמַר. He rejected the idea that כּסְפָיָן was in its Vorlage, since

for similar phrases in 8:22, 24 τεχνης was used. He thought that ἀληθῆν, unique in Daniel and rare in LXX as a whole, indicated that some form of Aramaic ἀληθῆ was understood by the Greek translator: it was probably not in the Hebrew text but some ‘fanciful exegesis’ led to ἀληθῆ being interpreted as ‘power’. Without considering the possibility of a mechanical error in Hebrew leading to the Aramaism in Greek, he went on to suggest that original Aramaic may have been אַלְיְאַרְי, ‘his power’ and that the usual error was made by the translator into Hebrew, not recognising the Aramaic word, but in addition ‘tacitly correcting’ it with the root ἀληθῆ, as LXX seemed to have done. This produced the meaning ‘not according to his posterity’, ἀληθῆ ἀληθηρίτω.

Zimmermann also found ellipticism in the Hebrew of 11:4, since he expected a verb after each אִלָּה. He attributed it to Aramaic syntax in which the copula is usually expressed by רָבָא, with ל to indicate relationship. He posited an Aramaic text, אָלֶה אַתְמֵי לָוָהַהוּ אֱלֹה אָלֶה כָּלֵּשֵׁנֶה יִדְּעֵנֶה, i.e. ‘It shall not be in his power and it shall not be as his dominion that he ruled’, and assumed the Hebrew translator found this difficult to express.

Response to Zimmermann’s assessment of this phrase must be that ‘not to his posterity’ makes sense in context and is historically accurate about Alexander’s succession. His replacement, ‘not as his sword’, is hardly an improvement! In addition, the solution is based on a reading אָלֶה in the Peshitta. This was the reading Montgomery used in 1927 but the Leiden critical edition of the Peshitta has corrected this to אָלֶה. It is difficult to see what problem Zimmermann found with the lack of copulas since the phrases in question are adverbial, modifying the verb וַיהָיָה. His

99 Ibid.
100 Cf Montgomery, A Critical, 426. See Taylor, The Peshitta, 6-8, for the problems with the Syriac text of Daniel available to these scholars.
original solution of the problem with OG variant τὴν ἀλήθινον αἰτίαν could be a
misreading of an Aramaic word, not just reading an Aramaic term in a Hebrew
account.

11:11, 13, הָנַעַמְמִד הָוֹז, 11:14 הָנַעַמְמִד הָוֹז. Zimmermann recognised that רָעַמ
had the sense of רָע, but he thought it an error, so that the verbs should have
been לָקֵי and לָקֵי respectively; cf 8:17, 18; 10:11.101

Whilst Zimmermann realised this usage was found in LBH, he seemed unaware that it
was a common phenomenon.102

H Nuances of Words Missed by the Translator

8:24 וְרָבְרוּ בַּיִת. He saw this as mistranslation of לִבְרָע, ‘he will
destroy the leaders’, with ‘rabrebin’ misread as ‘rabraban’. He compared this
to לִשְׁחָה הָבִים in the same verse and לִשְׁחָה הָבִים in v 25.103

What Zimmermann imagined was graphic error in Aramaic and רְבִּרְבָּן would be a
suitable word in 8:24; 11:36. However the adverbial use of נְמַלְאָדָה has already been
established in MT,104 and an expression of large scale destruction suits the context.

 Cf 11:7, 17, 28, 32, 11:36. Zimmermann thought all the difficult
uses of נְשַׁי in Hebrew Daniel could be accounted for by Aramaic רְבִּרְבָּן,
‘work, do’, but even this produced ‘lame and puzzling’ meanings in context.

103 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 36 only. He suggested נְמַלְאָדָה in 11:36 represented
Aramaic רְבִּרְבָּן, cf 7:8, where was often translated ‘great things’ but meant
‘boastful things’. The Hebrew therefore meant ‘he will vaunt himself ( against God ).’
Zimmermann cites Ginsberg, Studies, 30, for this translation. It is not on p 30, but Hölscher is
cited by Ginsberg as first drawing comparison between the Hebrew and Aramaic phrases.
He resorted to an Eastern Aramaic meaning of מלח, ‘wage war, do battle’, citing Brockelmann, 572 for the verb militavit, noun קדד פל ‘miles’, adjective אַרְמָן militaris, nouns מלחור וּמָלְאָה milita and מלחור וּמָלְאָה exercitus (which corresponds to Peshitta מלחה in 2 Chr 33:5), and even Hebrew קדד פל ‘soldier’ in Ben Yehudah, 4943 n 1. On the assumption that מלח with this sense was in the original Aramaic, he produced the following translations: 8:24 ‘and he will wage war’; 11:7 for זָעָה כְּבָּה ‘he shall do battle against them’; 11:17 זָעָה ‘and he will attack’; 11:28 זָעָה ‘and he shall do battle’; 11:32 זָעָה ‘and (they) will fight back’; 11:39 זָעָה ‘And he shall do battle (against the fortified strongholds)’.

This issue was also addressed by Ginsberg.105

11:35 לְבָּלָה 12:10 מְהִימָנָת He found the meaning in 11:35 ‘to make white’ odd, and assumed it was a translation of Aramaic כָּרְבָּה (hawwara), to ‘wash clean, make clear’, from the targumic rendering for הבט. He cited Onqelos in Exod 19:14; Lev 6:20; 13:55, 56; and a figurative use in Jer 4:14. Similarly the verb in 12:10 he translated ‘and (many) shall be washed clean’.106

Zimmermann may have been correct but, if so, this is another example of calque.

12:3 מְרַצֵּר נַרְבִּים Zimmermann found ‘those that justify the multitude’ a weak expression, and thought the sense ‘those that give merit to many’ superior. He applied the same solution here as in 8:14, i.e. tracing use of קד in Hebrew to Aramaic מְרַצֵּר or מְרַצֵּר. He noted the variants: LXX καὶ όι κατισχυοντες

104 Cf pages 26-7 and Job 27:5.
105 Zimmermann, ibid. Ginsberg, Studies, 47, (b), explained this word differently, but not in this verse. He addressed the problem in 8:12; cf page 100; in 11:7 cf page 101; in 11:28, 30; cf page 102; and in 11:39, cf page 106: his main argument is contained in Studies, 49, (h) and note a.
106 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 37 only.
hon λόγος μου, reading ἐρωτήμα τερ απὸ τῶν δικαιῶν τῶν πολλῶν, reading ἐστίν ρήμα; V qui ad iustiam erudiant multos, a free rendering; but he did not address the problem of the OG verb.

He retroverted to Aramaic מַגֵּי שָׁחְאָר; or רֶכֶם מִשָּׁחֲאָר, which he claimed would mean ‘those that give merit to many’ instead of the usual ‘justify many’, citing Aramaic מַגֵּי and the Mish Abot ν, 26, used by Bevan, in which the root רכָּם was used in participial form to mean ‘he who makes the many virtuous’.

Ginsberg considered the phrase very good Biblical Hebrew, citing Isa 53:11, and he agreed that it was translated from Aramaic only because other evidence showed the whole text to be so. He clearly did not think, as few would, that ‘give merit to many’ was any improvement on the sense of MT.

Final Example

11:17 לְהַשֵּׁתִיתוֹ Montgomery’s verdict of ‘absurd’ on the sense ‘to destroy her / it’ was echoed by Zimmermann in 1938. He cited the most common Aramaic equivalent of תָּשַׁש in the Targums, לָבֹת, assuming a consonantal text in an original of לֶבֶת, which a translator read as לָבֶת when the author intended לְבַכֵּת, ‘to his hurt’. In this account of the giving of Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemy V by Antiochus III she is subject of the sentence, and it should continue, ‘and she shall not stand ( by him ), not be for him’. This is in Aramaic, מַתִּירֵהוּ לָבֹת לְלִבּוֹת אֲלֵיהוּ.
His 1975 explanation of this words differed from the above. Whilst still basing it on the lexical equivalence of Hebrew השוה and Aramaic הובל, he thought Aramaic אבל (hubala), was confused with הובל (hubullu), citing Brockelmann, 211, ‘pledge, security’. So the passage should have read ‘and he shall give him the daughter of women for a surety, but she shall not stand by him, nor be for him’. 111

Ginsberg took up the idea that the pronominal suffix had been misread in Aramaic as feminine instead of masculine, but he retroverted the word into a verb, לוחבלות. He said that the Hebrew should have read לוחבלות. 112

This putative misreading of an ambiguous Aramaic suffix may indicate an Aramaic Vorlage.

**Evidence not included in Zimmermann's 1975 work**

The following early explanations were, presumably, later rejected by Zimmermann.

**Syntactical Errors**

8:23 לוחבלות Since a plural noun was used in the previous verse, the context demanded one here. Aramaic לוחבלות, could have been misread for לוחבלות, as the consonants of singular and plural are identical. 113

12:11 סנה Comparisons made by others with Jer 36:2 and 2 Chr 20:22, did not seem apt to Zimmermann, as they did not have the infinitive. Though some

---

113 Zimmermann, ‘Some Verses’, 350.
followed to read מְנַהֲג, he suggested Aramaic מְנַהֲג or מְנַהֲג was the original, and a translator wrongly read an infinitive instead of a verbal substantive, ‘the setting up’. The Hebrew should therefore read מְנַהֲג שְׁמֵם וְלֹא נִהֲזָה.\footnote{Zimmermann, ‘Some Verses’, 350-1.}

It is notable that the above two examples were errors in reading a written text, but since Zimmermann himself seems to have rejected them, they will not be analysed further.

8:5 מְנַהֲג שְׁמֵם מְכֹבִי. Zimmermann noted that this was a Hebrew equivalent of 7:8 מְנַהֲג לֵוֵת הָדִיר, though he did not recognise it as a calque of that phrase.\footnote{Cf pages 39, 58.} He thought a translator used מְכֹבִי implying מְכֹבִי, assuming the Aramaic sense would be understood and unaware of how strange the Hebrew would read.\footnote{Zimmermann, ‘Hebrew’, 202; ‘Some Verses’, 350.}

10:12 מְכֹבִי לְאָתַת תַּנּוּס. He did not think that in the expression ‘understand and be humbled ( before your God )’, the two verbs married sensibly. His suggestion was that מְכֹבִי was used as the standard equivalent of Aramaic סְבָר, but the author used סְבָר in the sense ‘suffer, sustain affliction’; cf Targ Deut 32:29.

Zimmermann implied the translator misunderstood the Aramaic, when in fact his observation could amount to another calque in Hebrew.\footnote{Zimmermann, ‘Hebrew’, 204.}

8:27 מְכֹבִי מְכֹבִי. Similarly Zimmermann found Aramaic סְבָר as the key to this phrase, which he retroverted to אֲתָא אֲתָא אֲתָא מְכֹבִי, ‘there was none to explain it’.\footnote{Zimmermann, ‘Some Verses’, 350-1.}

10:16 מְכֹבִי מְכֹבִי. Cf 11:6. He regarded this phrase as peculiar because עֶצֶר...
means to ‘press’! He thought הָיָלָא לְאֶפֶן (אֲבָרַת מַעְטָי) was the Aramaic behind it, but this was hard to translate into Hebrew, and he cited Ben Sira 5:3 where it is translated יָכַל בּוֹדָה. The translator took the Aramaic in its second meaning of ‘press’ rather than its first of ‘be able’. Cf Chronicles.119

We note the idiom על זר הבן occurs at least seven times in MT: in Dan 10:8, 16; 11:6; 1 Chr 29:14; 2 Chr 2:5; 13:20; 22:9. According to Ja, Vol 2, 1103, Hebrew על זר has a wide range of meanings whereas the cognate Aramaic only has to ‘press, squeeze, keep back, save’. Even if the post-biblical Hebrew verb has expanded its semantic range under the influence of Aramaic, and this is by no means obvious, it is no reason to see this particular usage as proof of an Aramaic manuscript behind the Hebrew.

**Zimmermann’s Chapter Three: Idols in Daniel via the Aramaic**

In his third chapter, Zimmermann turned his attention to Hebrew terms in Daniel chs 8-12 usually translated ‘abomination of desolation’. He thought the variation in the Hebrew for this expression was evidence of translation from Aramaic.

He rejected the idea of E Nestle120 that the Hebrew is a word play on הָעִלָּב שְׁכֵם, ‘Lord of Heaven’,121 because he felt that a Jewish writer of the time of Daniel would not have given this title to a foreign god when it was a name reserved for the God of Israel, and this would apply to its use in Aramaic. So he argued that the title נָמָך שְׁכֵם was limited by the Jews to the God of the Jews, citing Dan 5:23; אֱלָה שְׁכֵם

---

118 Zimmermann ibid. Ginsberg explained this phrase differently; cf Chapter Three, pages 107-8.
120 E Nestle, ‘Zu Daniel’ ZATW 4 (1884), 247-8 (248), also Marginalien und Materialien, 35; Bevan, A Short Commentary 193.
121 Cooke, A Text-book of North Semitic Inscriptions (1903, Oxford, Clarendon),45; the term is
Ezra 1:2; Ps 136:26. They would more often lampoon an alien god, as e.g. in Josh 19:50; 24:30 caricatures of Judg 2:9: cf other terms e.g. גלל, גלל, a word play on שברים, שברים, and נון 'go a-whoring after'.

I. Zimmermann saw the key to the expressions for ‘abomination of desolation’ in Aramaic סחרה, meaning to ‘be foul, stink; sin’ (the Aramaic noun סחרה being a regular usage for פנין, פנין and מושע; to ‘lay waste’ (cf PS s v; Brockelmann, 498 a). He reconstructed the meaning of each of the Hebrew terms in this way.

8:13 The underlying Aramaic was סחרה ד_absolute which was intended to convey the meaning ‘the defiling pollution’. The translator chose the meaning ‘lay waste’ for the verb instead of the intended ‘defile’ (cf Dan 11:31), but שֵׁלֵם used instead of a ‘defiling’ sense was the chief error made in translation. The noun likewise misunderstood to mean ‘sin’, was mistranslated מַשְׁעַ when it should have been interpreted as ‘pollution’, like רַמְמָה; cf Ps 79:1. For the translator the idol was ‘the great sin, par excellence’ but מַשְׁע was incorrect because it was not usually employed for a ‘set-up idol’. The definite article reflected the determinate state of סחרה, but the article was omitted from the participle in Hebrew because of the absolute state of the Aramaic word in סחרה.

Ginsberg found a possible example of an otiose ה, a vowel letter, to give רֹא מַשְׁע, translating ‘a revolting offense’.  

---

122 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 39  
124 Ginsberg, Studies, 81, note 23; 82, notes 35, 41, 52, for his English translation; cf page 98, 11. See also 11:6, page 100.
In the above vein, Zimmermann thought that בָּשָׂש in 8:12 represented ‘pollution’ and not ‘sin’, and the Hebrew was a mistranslation of בָּשָׂש. When the statue was set up at the side of the Tamid and swine’s flesh was offered, this doubly polluted the sanctuary, and was reflected in the double expression בתוּדָה וּרְאָה.\textsuperscript{125} translated more accurately, ‘even brilliantly,’ in the phrases using שֵׁם.

9:27 Zimmermann traced the expression to בתוּדָה ורְאָה where a translator read שְׂרָפָה, a plural of שַׁדָּה, for שִׁבָּר and translated שֵׁם.

Ginsberg noted Nestle’s suggestion on this phrase, but he insisted that this was not a Greek god but a paganised form of ‘the God of Heaven’, and the same in 11:31; 12:11 and 8:13. This is contra Zimmermann, but his retroversions stand regardless of this interpretation.

For בַּשָּׂש at the end of the verse, Zimmermann suggested Aramaic רֹאֵנָה וּרְאָה, ‘the defiler’, a shortened form of the previous phrase. He thought the translator was perplexed with the Aramaic expressions and so ‘straddled the issue’ with this rendering; he did not explain why the particle ה should be found in the original at this point instead of a preposition, as in MT עַל שֵׁם.\textsuperscript{126}

11:31 According to Zimmermann this represented בתוּדָה ורְאָה. Since בתוּדָה carried no sign of definiteness, the definite article was automatically omitted; cf 8:13; 9:27; 12:11.\textsuperscript{127}

12:11 He regarded this as a straightforward translation of בתוּדָה.
Zimmermann was adducing another form of calque to explain these expressions. That the same root should lie behind both expressions is a weakness in his argument, but he may have found an explanation for the difficult מַשְׂה in 8:12 and מָדַשְׂה in 8:13.

II. In the light of this understanding, Zimmermann proceeded to examine Dan 8:9-14.

8:9 חֲבֶל הָאָרֶץ He argued that this did not necessarily represent Aramaic רַבָּת הָאָרֶץ, ‘it grew up mightily’, rather than ‘it spread, it traversed mightily’: though a horn naturally grew upwards, it was described as ‘growing’ to the south, the east and towards Judah, and the accurate meaning was ‘spread’. Cf the common verb סָנָה, ‘to go’. 129

8:10 לָשׁוֹן הַשָּׁמַים He equated this with קֹלֵל שְׁמוֹי,130 to which he attributed the sense ‘the hosts of God’, not ‘the host of heaven’, since שְׁמוֹי was a euphemism for God (cf 4:23). He cited Exod 12:41 for the expression אֵבָא וְיִשְׂרָאֵל understood as a designation of the priests; T Levi 16:1, which speaks of profanation of the priesthood; Neh 13:29.131

8:11 רַבְּר מָרִים Zimmermann retroverted the phrase to132 רב הַיִלְוי, which he took as metonymy for the High Priest, ‘stars’ representing lesser priests and Levites.

128 Ibid.
129 Cf page 58 note 19; page 63. Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 41. רַבָּת הָאָרֶץ was used by Ginsberg, Studies, 53, in his retroversion.
130 This is Ginsberg’s Aramaic; ibid: see Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 42, for this item.
131 Zimmermann, ibid.
132 This also is Ginsberg’s Aramaic; cf Studies, 53.
Zimmermann argued that verse 12 was so difficult it could only be dealt with after understanding v13. He summarised the context of vv 12-14 as implying that an idol was set up in the sanctuary; then one divine being asks how long this pollution will be set up and the sanctuary and priesthood trampled upon. The answer is 2300 days and then the sanctuary will be cleansed. From this Zimmermann deduced that אָכְלָה equals ‘idol’ in some way, the Aramaic perhaps being אָכְלָה, which was used for חֵתֶר in Exod 8:22 and for לְאֹל in Lev 26:1; 2 Kgs 18:4 (אָכְלָה in the Peshitta). He cited the determinate, אָכְלָה, used in targums for alien gods, e.g. Exod 20:23 אָכְלָה נֵסָה לְאֹלֹת נָב, and suggested a translator mistook feminine אָכְלָה, ‘host’. He said the feminine verb agreement with אָכְלָה, and על should be taken with אָכְלָה to mean ‘set up on high’; cf חֵתֶר על, 2 Sam 23:1; Hos 7:16; 11:7; BDB 752. אָכְלָה, Aramaic אָכְלָה, was an error for אָכְלָה, ‘continually’ (after Ginsberg) for v 11 suggests the Tamid had already been removed. בָּמָשׂ was a mistranslation of בָּמָשׂ ‘with pollution’. Zimmermann supplied a full English translation of 8:9-14 incorporating the above changes in meaning.

There are elements in Zimmermann’s explanations that might indicate Aramaic graphic error, such as אָכְלָה read for אָכְלָה, and אָכְלָה read for אָכְלָה, but in
general he was simply supplying Aramaic equivalents for selected parts of the Hebrew as he understood the text.

III

11:37 He argued the Aramaic hypothesis confirms the identity of this expression with the god, Dionysios.137 Aramaic would be דודיבא ד לשלחא, ‘Dinesayya’ being a derisory pun on Dionysios; cf the Dionysiac rites described in 1 Macc 6:7; Cambridge Ancient History, viii, 508, ‘Yahweh was perhaps identified with Dionysios’.138

11:38 Zimmermann rejected various conjectures about the god referred to here139 and the hypothesis of Ginsberg, that a paganised form of the God of Israel was the deity.140 He suggested that Zeus Olympios may have been intended in the description, based on one of his primitive titles, Herkeios, i.e. ‘Zeus of the Fort’, citing Moore, History of Religions, I, 414. However, he decided a better explanation could be found in the legend of Zeus suckled by a goat. קפיטם should therefore be repointed דרוי, ‘(a god stemming from goats)’, a derisive epithet for Zeus. He found a progression in v 37-38, covering the period in which Antiochus IV first favoured the cult of Apollo, then that of Zeus, finally deifying himself, depicted as Zeus.141

In this singular explanation for מגדים Zimmermann seemed to lose sight of an Aramaic Vorlage altogether!

137 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 43-4, provided a description of the cult practices associated with devotion to Dionysios based on the work of J Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of the Greek Religion, ch 8 and H J Rose, Handbook of Greek Mythology, ch 6; he rejected the more popular association of this Hebrew expression with Tammuz as put forward by Ewald..
138 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 43-4 only.
139 For these he referred to Montgomery, A Critical, 461.
140 See Ginsberg, Studies, 43-5. Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 44, argues his points against Ginsberg, for a summary of whose ideas see Chapter Three, pages 102-3.
141 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 45-6, for the first explanation and references to the goat legend.
Summary

Zimmermann’s evidence covered a broad scope of words and expressions which he sometimes found difficult to define, hence the change in some of his titles to certain material. He acknowledged early on that Aramaisms do not constitute proof of an Aramaic Vorlage, but a great deal of the material which followed comprised semantic influence of an underlying Aramaic text upon a Hebrew translation. A small amount of his evidence seemed to involve some form of error in reading written Aramaic.

Although he did not refer to it as such, calque of Aramaic is a predominant characteristic that has emerged from his analysis, and those he noticed will be collated in the final chapter. Continuing analysis of his evidence will only deal with what appear to be indications of ambiguous Aramaic graphic forms, or misreading of written text. These examples are twelve in all:

8:14 נזך וקדיש
8:23 מבות ידדית
9:26 ו岑
9:27 נגביר בירית
9:27 מב
10:1 וצרה גודל 롭
10:11, 19 איש המזורות
11:2 לאמו לארוהתי
11:7 הוב אמל החל
11:20 מניב נגש זר דמלוח
11:17 להשתיהה
11:4 לאל אבדה
12:2 אדומת עפר

12:2 אדומת עפר will also be analysed. This phrase was included in Zimmermann’s semantic evidence, but is included in further study because of textual evidence; cf Chapter Seven, pages 284-286.
Chapter Three

H Louis Ginsberg's Arguments in ‘Studies in Daniel’

Ginsberg’s ‘Overwhelming Additional Proof’

Ginsberg was convinced that Zimmermann had established his thesis, although he agreed with Baumgartner\(^1\) who thought that not all his arguments were cogent. However, Ginsberg accepted Zimmermann’s evidence of semantic errors as pointing to a translation from Aramaic. Ginsberg offered what he described as ‘overwhelming additional proof’, sometimes correcting what he considered weaknesses in Zimmermann’s evidence.

A. Antiochus Epiphanes’ Measures Against the Jewish Religion.

Chapter 8:7-14

In 8:7-14 Ginsberg revised the Hebrew of the MT with a large number of emendations before retroverting it to Aramaic. The changes he made to the text are concentrated in vv 11-12 and he gave the following justification for them.\(^2\)

1. מָכֵרָה, which begins v 12, he attached to the end of v11 coupled with מֶכֶּרָה, just as יִכְּרֶהַ זָּבַב in v 13, a ‘well-known’ textual emendation.

2. He deleted the pronominal suffix of מֶכֶּרָה in v 11 as a dittography of Vav in מָכֵרָה; cf again v13.

---


\(^2\) Ginsberg, Studies, 49-2
3. In v 12 he read בֵּן, after Theodotion, ἃμαρτία.

4. He repointed מַעֲנָה, in v12 as מַעֲנָה and claimed this was a form of Aramaism unlikely to be found in an original Hebrew composition; cf מַעֲנָה in 2:16.

5. The three verbs in v11 Ginsberg made feminine to agree with the preceding ones in vv 9-10, where מַעֲנָה is the subject, and with those that follow in v12. He also amended them to imperfect since this required only changing the preformative נ to נ in each verb. He read these imperfects as historic presents, as in BA; cf 4:2, 31, 33; 7:16, 28.

6. Ginsberg emended this, the last verb in v11, to מַעֲנָה, because just to feminise it as in 5 (above) produced מַעֲנָה, which also occurred in v 12 and made better sense in that verse than in v 11. The end of v 13, i.e. מְרָמֵס, gave the correct root for the context in v11, and this had, at some stage been replaced by the one in v12.

7. Ginsberg felt that מַעֲנָה emended to מַעֲנָה was correct in gender and tense, but not in root, following parallels יַרְדֵּנ in 11:31 and הָדָר in 12:11. The transposition of consonants, and change of נ to ס, would give מְרָמֵס, but Ginsberg did not ‘insist upon this’ and so recorded them as alternatives.

8. He thought מַעֲנָה superfluous in v 11, as shown by the parallel at the end of v13, but ‘sorely needed’ in v 11b and in v12 a, because ‘from him it removed the daily sacrifice’ was ‘harsh’, and ‘it set up upon the daily sacrifice an offense’ was ‘atrocious’. Further, since מַעֲנָה did not accord with the syntax of v 11b but did fit between הָדָר and מְרָמֵס in v 12a, he transferred it there, so the sense became, ‘and it set up upon the stand of the daily sacrifice an offense’.

---

3 Ginsberg, Studies, 51, seemed to be referring to מַעֲנָה without מַעֲנָה at the end of v 13.
agreeing with 1 Macc 1:54.

9. In the light of 8 (above) Ginsberg amended מַעַמֵּן in v 11 to מָעַמְנַה, though he allowed for the alternative emendation of מָעַמְנַה.

He justified his divergences from the usual English translation, in the following ways.

10. In v 8 Ginsberg translated הַעַלָּר יִנָּגַלְתֵּשׁ into English as ‘his big horn’ on the basis that Aramaic רַךְ נַר was read רַךְ נַר, ‘the horn’, instead of רַךְ נַר, ‘his horn’, by the translator.4

11. In v 13 he translated ‘a (revolting) offense’ because רַךְ in רַךְ עִשָּׂר could be a vowel letter, like רַךְ in בַּשָּׂר of Lam 5:18 et al, or in רַךְ כְּ, Qoh 8:1. Cf Qoh 2:8 וַתִּגְנֹב הַרְּכֹת מְדוּנָה; 7:25 וַתִּגְנֹב מְדוּנָה; and קָר in the Hadad inscription.5

12. In v 14 he translated וְתֵבֵין ‘shall be cleansed’; cf Chapter 2, page 61, 8:14.

He retroverted this amended text of MT into Aramaic making the following substitutions.6

1. Aramaic רֶפֶס for Hebrew רֶפֶס in vv 7b, 10b, cf 7:7, 19.

2. Aramaic רַכְוֵ (Haphel of רַכְוֵ), ‘to profane’, for Hebrew רַכְוֵ in vv 11b, 13b, where the Aramaic was misread or corrupted to רַכְוֵ under the influence of this root used as above. Ginsberg, guided by the uncontracted Haphel in BA of Daniel, argued that רַכְוֵ was more likely than רַכְוֵ to be the form misread as

4 Ginsberg, Studies, 52 and 82 note 38.
5 Ginsberg, Studies, 52, 82 notes 41 & 35, 81 note 23. See 11:6 for another putative use of otiose רַךְ; cf page 100.
6 Ginsberg, Studies, 53-5.
but, with רפס occurring before, it might have been a contracted verb.7

3. He substituted Aramaic (הכרות) for Hebrew יְהֹוָה vv 10, 11a.

4. Aramaic קְשֵׁי, absolute (or קְשֵׁי הַשָּׁמֶשׁ, emphatic) was Ginsberg’s equivalent for Hebrew יָתִג in vv 12a, 13b. He said קְשֵׁי, ‘saints, pious ones’, was misread or corrupted to (הכרות) under the influence of the preceding יַעֲבֹר. He categorised this as ‘erroneous identification’ rather than ‘misreading’, and based the need for a word meaning ‘saints’ on parallels in ch 11 and on 1 Maccabees, arguing that in ch 11 יִתְנָה was identified as קְשֵׁי, ‘stronghold, citadel’, because it was preceded by קְשֵׁי and cognate words several lines earlier in the chapter.8 (This verb was turned correctly into Hebrew because there was no nearby form of רֶפֶס to mislead the translator, since רֶפֶס did not occur in the Hebrew of ch 11.) On the other hand in 8:11-13, he said יָתִג always meant the Jews, i.e. the ‘saints’, but, as ‘host’ is not a natural metonymy for ‘saints’, the reason for its use had to be found in an Aramaic original. Therefore the correct Hebrew equivalent of קְשֵׁי should have been קֶדֶר בֵּית.

Arising from this retroversion he made additional comments as follows.

In 8:7 קְשֶׁי קְבָרִי was ‘very unhebraic’ and it came from a literal rendering of Aramaic קְשֶׁי קְבָרִי; cf Syriac, and 11:27.9

In 8:12, if יְהֹוָה rather than קְשֶׁי was the original Aramaic of אֶלֶף, then it was an allusion to an Aramaic proverb, יְהֹוָה בְּאַרְעָא וּנְגָזִיא בְּשֵׂם שֵׁלמִי, ‘the native below and the stranger above’; cf TP Hagigah 76a; TB Erubin 9a; Baba

7 Ginsberg, Studies, 53 and 82 note 52; 54.
8 Ginsberg, Studies, 52-4; see 80, 2), ch 11:31.
9 Ginsberg, Studies, 53; 82, note 45a, referring to 61, 13.
In 8:12 could derive from root נַעֲרֵב, נַעֲרֵב misread as נַעֲרֵב נַעֲרֵב. However Ginsberg still retroverted it to נַעֲרֵב נַעֲרֵב and translated it ‘he prospered in what he did’.\(^\text{11}\)

In 8:13 could be from original Aramaic לַמְלִים וְלַמְלִים.\(^\text{12}\)

Chapter 11:1-39

11:1 Ginsberg reverted to Aramaic לַמְלִים וְלַמְלִים, ‘as a strengthener and fortifier for him’, suggesting the reconstruction was a play on words with the speaker’s name, גָּבֶר. Since גָּבֶר occurred frequently in 10:18; 11:7, it might not always represent the same Aramaic root, but probably could be traced to Aramaic גָּבֶר sometimes.\(^\text{13}\) Cf 11:6, the following.

11:6 Ginsberg, referring this to the violent deaths of Berenice, Antiochus II and their infant at the hands of Laodice and Seleucus II, said לַמְלִים וְלַמְלִים meant ‘her child and her husband’: he emended לַמְלִים וְלַמְלִים or לַמְלִים to לַמְלִים וְלַמְלִים, ‘and he whom she hath borne’, from Aramaic רֵי לַמְלִים; better in Hebrew as אֲשֶׁר לְלִדָּה.

he took as a mistranslation of לַמְלִים וְלַמְלִים, ‘and her husband’, another example of לְמִי for גָּבֶר.

Zimmermann agreed with Ginsberg concerning לָמְלִים וְלָמְלִים but not לַמְלִים וְלַמְלִים.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{10}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 52, 54; 82-3, note 53.

\(^{11}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 49 (h) note a; 54, for his retroversion: cf 11:7, 28, 30, 39; pages 101-2, 106.

\(^{12}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 83, note 54; 54 for the retroversion.

\(^{13}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 46, (a).

11:7 Ginsberg accepted Zimmermann’s idea of the misreading of ל as preposition instead of nota objectiva, though he did not acknowledge Zimmermann at this point. He incorporated this into a reconstruction into Aramaic.

Ginsberg based Aramaic רידבר upon the repointing of MT כו to רידבר, and he suggested that final ב of לְהִידָלַתּ was the 3rd masculine singular pronominal suffix, which had been misread as sign of the emphatic state. He also amended MT בּוּלִיתוּ to בּוּלִיתוּ on the strength of the plural suffix in בּוּלִיתוּ following, and the plural suffixes which continue into v 8.15

11:8b נֵדַח עָשִׂים וְיָמִדְמִד מַלְכָּה נְפִימוּ he retroverted to רְעֵבְר בָּהוֹלִין but referred to 11:39 where he retroverted רְעֵבְר to רְעֵבְר, following the lead of the Syriac. He translated the clause here, ‘and he shall do his pleasure in them’.16

11:7: Ginsberg, Studies, 47, ( b ), notes a and c.
11:8b: Ginsberg, Studies, 47, (c) and note d.
was retroverted by Ginsberg as אֵלֶּה בְּהַמֵּמָה שֶׁיָּפְעֵיהּ, following the Q Hebrew. He noted that Hebrew שָׁבָה, besides being rendered in Aramaic by רֹדָב, could be the equivalent of הָדַּר, הָדָר or הָדוֹר.\textsuperscript{18}

Ginsberg retroverted this to אֵלֶּה בְּהַמֵּמָה אֵלֶּה בְּהַמֵּמָה. He gave רֹדָב as the plural of רֹדָב, but noted the Q reading in 7:10 כֹּבֵן, plural of כֹּבֶן, Hebrew כֹּבֶן.\textsuperscript{19}

Ginsberg retroverted to Aramaic מִזְרַע אֲרֻעַ; this contrasts with his retroversion of מִזְרַע in vv 31, 38, 39 (below).\textsuperscript{20}

he traced to Aramaic מִזְרַע misread as מִזְרַע.\textsuperscript{21}

Ginsberg studied the three occurrences of מִזְרַע in their general context in Daniel, and any other relevant material. In his search for a single Aramaic word which would suit all three uses, and which a translator could have taken to be the equivalent of Hebrew מִזְרַע or מְצַוְעָה, he came up with a surprising meaning, ‘the Jewish people’, because of certain facts which he accepted:

a) In v 39 the word stood opposite יִשְׂרָאֵל, which was read as יִשָּׁב בָּאָרֶץ, ‘people of a (strange) god’. (He regarded the sense ‘walled cities of fortresses’ as an ‘inane tautology’.)

b) It was generally accepted that the walled cities were Jewish cities.

c) In v 31 the sense ‘Jewish people’ occupying the position of מִזְרַע was

\textsuperscript{18} Ginsberg, Studies, 47, (c), notes a, b.
\textsuperscript{19} Ginsberg, Studies, 48, (d) and note.
\textsuperscript{20} Ginsberg, Studies, 48, (e).
\textsuperscript{21} Ginsberg, Studies, 49, (h), note a. Cf 11:7 above and note 13.
appropriate, and 1 Macc 1:44-54 was evidence for this interpretation.  

Ginsberg further argued that, since the Jews were called ‘saints (of the Most High)’ in ch 7, and ‘people of saints’ in 8:24 (cf ‘holy people’ in 12:7), מנהר in 11:31 (cf 1 Macc 1:46) and in 11:38, 39 must be an erroneous rendering of an Aramaic word for ‘saints’ which might also be mistaken for a word meaning ‘fortress’ or ‘fortresses’. The Aramaic word יִּדְתָּן (plural of אֵדֶת ) was easily misread as מְדֻת, ‘stronghold’, or מְדֻּת, ‘strongholds’. (Cf Syriac Ḥeṣa, ‘hesna’ or Ḥusna’ both meaning ‘stronghold, the latter in Targ Ps 31:3, and also ‘hisna’, ‘the strength’, in Dan 2:37.)

From the meaning ‘Jewish people’ in v 38, he reasoned that:

1) Since the walled cities of מִנְעֵי יָהֳעִיר in v 38 was
   unlikely to mean a pagan god.

2) עֹלְנָא could not mean ‘instead of him’ but ‘instead of them’ since v 37 refers to
   many gods, and מִנְעֵי אָבֵ Judiciary, meaning ‘gods of his fathers’ (in contrast to
   2:23), not ‘god of his fathers’, is too distant to be the antecedent. Only a
   singular, מִנְעֵי in Aramaic, מִנְעֵי in Hebrew, was used for a single god in the
   book of Daniel.

Ginsberg went on to discuss the text according to what is known of Antiochus IV’s
   attitude to the gods, and a comparison between it and 8:10-12.

   He argued from an unamended v 38 that the first מִנְעֵי, must be a euphemism,
   but two different meanings of the same root would be unlikely in the same
   verse. He said that עֹלְנָא in v 38a was a ‘superior’ variant of מִנְעֵי in
   v 38b, and that it had replaced either מַיְנָא or מִנְעֵי (or words) that originally

---

22 Cf Ginsberg, Studies, 45-6, for the detailed argument on this point.
On this basis Ginsberg produced Aramaic retroversions of these Hebrew verses some of which he emended first.

11:31 He traced the Hebrew,

\[ \text{ Cherry McConnell and her companions.}\]

back to ‘something like’ Aramaic

\[ \text{הו} \text{ דְּרָעִים מִנֵּה קֵומִים וְהָיוּ מַקְדֵּשִׁים וְהָמָּשׁוֹעֵתָן וְהָתְמוּנִים וּסְמֵךְּוֹן שָׁם.}\]

He suggested the Hebrew plural יְרֵעִים was an imitation of an Aramaic plural, since יִרְעֶה is masculine; citing Targ O Deut 26:8:26; cf the Peshitta, where all four words are emphatic as normal in Syriac.\(^{24}\)

Ginsberg preferred Palestinian Aramaic for ‘profane’, Haphel of מְסָטֶס, rather than דְּרָעִים, though he considered both roots equally as likely. This was because on other occasions he thought the Hebrew could only have originated from Aramaic מְסָטֶס.\(^{25}\)

He chose מְסָטֶס as counterpart to יְרֵעִים since, although the Hebrew had the article with two successive substantives, he felt the translator had been unsure about the relation between the Hebrew article and the Aramaic emphatic state. He concluded the conjunction had fallen out before שָׁם; cf the parallels in ch 8, 1 Macc 1:46, ἁγιάσμα καὶ ἁγιοὺς. He justified מְסָטֶס, ‘saints’,

---

\(^{23}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 42-6 for the whole of this section: his arguments are convoluted and I hope I have represented them correctly!

\(^{24}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 48, (f) and notes a, b.
because in 1 Macc 1:46 the saints were profaned by enforced profane behaviour, appealing to Num 25 in Pseudo-Jonathan, ‘the people began to profane their sanctity’.  

26 He said נָתַתָּם was a technical Hebraism in Aramaic and adduced נָתַתָּם as the native Aramaic alternative. Ginsberg said the Hebrew had probably been דֹּקָה, but the underlying Aramaic indeterminate as in 12:11; cf βεσπληγμα ἐρημοσκοῖς, 1 Macc 1:54.

For דֹּקָה ‘the sanctuary, the stronghold’ Zimmermann followed Ginsberg in using דֹּקָה to explain מַעֲרֵם, but he preferred Aramaic original מַכְּרֵם רְדִים, meaning ‘the sanctuary of the Almighty’. He thought the translator omitted יד רד, a common practice found in Chronicles and Nehemiah, 27 less frequently in Daniel. דֹּקָה was a well-known term for God; cf מַעֲרֵם for שָׁזִּי in the Peshitta, Job 8:3; Targ Ps 89:9; cf PS s v and Ben Yehudah s v. מַכְּרֵם, ‘stronghold, and מַכְּרֵם, (defective), ‘Almighty’, could easily be mistaken for each other and this forced the mistranslation.  

28

11:38  Ginsberg went on to suggest an emended Hebrew text for v 38:

רֱאָלֶה מַעֲרֵם תֹּאצָא (דֹּקָה) רֱאָלֶה אוֹשָר לְא תֹּמַתְתֵּי אֲבָחוֹתֵי על בָּנָי

He retroverted this to Aramaic:

יִדְעֶה אֱבוֹהָתוֹת עַל מַכְּרֵם הֲוֹקֵד לַאֲלֶלֶת אֵוָה יִד הֲדֵק לָאֲלֶלֶת אֵוָה לַא

Since he believed the original Hebrew of לַאֲלֶלֶת had been lost, he suggested קָנִית as a possibility, with the Aramaic equivalent a Haphel of קָנִית.

25 Ginsberg, Studies, 48, (f) and note c.
26 Ginsberg, Studies, 54, (2), cf 48 (f) notes d, f. Here he maintained that the Aramaic expression, a midrashic exegesis of the Hebrew הבלי as הֲוָקֵד, is contaminata with the spelling of קָנִית further on.
27 Zimmermann referred to his own evidence concerning the use of the particle in Chronicles and Nehemiah; Biblical Books, 136, 144.
28 See Ginsberg, Studies, 46, 48; Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 33; 10, B; ‘The Aramaic’, 258, B.
29 Sic Ginsberg, Studies; cf next footnote.
opposite of מַעְנָכָה citing 1 Sam 2:30. He chose as the regular Syriac equivalent of כֹּל and קְדָם. ³⁰

11:39 His Aramaic for MT וַהֲשָׁאָה לִמְבָרֵךְ עֲעֵזָה נַחֲרוּ הַשָּׁמֶשׁ וְעֵצָה בָּנֶיה is:

He assumed again that the Aramaic verb יִיעֶרֶב had been misread as יִיעֶר, represented by וַהֲשָׁאָה יִיעֶר in the MT; cf 11:28, 30. He noted that the Syriac read and surmised that this was an internal error for מַעְנָכָה, which must have been the Syriac translation from the original Hebrew. This underlined how easily this particular corruption could have occurred in Aramaic as well. ³¹

B. איותת וַרָאָה

In 8:16, 26a; 9:23; 10:1 Ginsberg asserted that מְרוּאָה always indicated what was heard, rather than seen, whereas in MT קְרָא could mean ‘vision’ or ‘oracle’. He argued that in Daniel מְרוּאָה never meant ‘vision’, for, when connected with sight, it meant ‘appearance, aspect’; cf 10:6: in 10:7, 8, 16 it carried the sense ‘apparition, manifestation, spectacle’, i.e. something that was ‘real’ and ‘produced the same image’ in ‘the physical eye as in the mind’. The animals pictured in ch 8 differed from this, for outside of Daniel’s mind they were two future dynasties. Outside of the book of Daniel מְרוּאָה never meant ‘oracle’.

³⁰ Cf Ginsberg, Studies, 49, (g) and notes.
³¹ Ginsberg, Studies, 49, (h) and note a. Cf 8:12, page 100; 11:7, 28, 30, pages 101-2.
He explained this apparent misuse of מָכַרְאָה in terms of translation from Aramaic of מַרְאָה, which in 5:12 meant i) ‘declaration, explanation, solution’ or ii) ‘exhibition’. It could have been used in 8:16, 26a; 10:1 with its first sense, whereas the second meaning was understood instead.32

גָּאִרְוָה

Ginsberg agreed with Charles33 that in 12:8 the last three words of the Aramaic original were מַרְאָה מַרְאָּה אֲלָלִין, ‘what is the explanation of these things?’ Thus the same Aramaic word as above, מַרְאָה, was mistranslated differently in this chapter. The translator, or a later scribe, misread מַרְאָּה ( cf 2:28 for this word in Aramaic ), for מַרְאָה מַרְאָּה. For the required sense ‘explanation’ he cited OG where מַרְאָה became מָכַרְאָה, ‘solution’.34

C Ginsberg’s Miscellaneous Proofs of Translation Hebrew

8:2, 3, 6 אֲבָלָה ( contaminated by אֲבָלָע אֲבָלָה ), אֲבָלָה אֲבָл—אֲבָל—אֲбָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲבָל—אֲגָוִרְוָה

32 Ginsberg, Studies, 55; 76, note 11; 84, notes 58 and 60; 32-3.
33 Charles, A Critical, 335-6.
34 Ginsberg, Studies, 55.
Ginsberg said the negative clause, מַהְרִי מְכָּרַת כָּפָּר, in v 5 should be rendered מִנְחַת, because in v 26 Daniel was told not to share his vision with anyone; but the phrase in MT means ‘with no one explaining’. Aramaic participles are usually negated by כְלָל; cf 2:43; 3:12, 16; 4:4, 6; 5:8, 23. In Hebrew כְּלָל negates the participle only in specific senses, e.g. ‘neither...nor’ and ‘nor...but’; otherwise the participial subject is negated instead by כְּלָל. The phrase in v 5 would read in Aramaic מִנְחַת and the translator used the correct Hebrew negative, not realising that it can only negate the subject which must be expressed by a pronominal suffix.

For v 27 he asserted that Aramaic for מַחְשַׁבָּה was either a participial expression like מַחְשַׁבָּת מַחְשַׁבָּה, the end of the sentence being כְּלָל כְּלָל, or, more likely it was כְּלָל כְּלָל. On this basis of this equivalence, Ginsberg retroverted MT מַחְשַׁבָּה לע הָמָרָא אֵית מְבֵי to:

מַחְשַׁבָּת לע הָמָרָא כְּלָל מְבֵי

and, since כְּלָל כְּלָל corresponded at that time to both כְּלָל and כְּלָל in Hebrew, (whereas later Syriac had אֶל for the former and אֶל for the latter), he assumed that a translator made the wrong choice. The Hebrew idiom should not have been a participle but an imperfect verb, as e.g. כְּלָל כְּלָל in 12:8.36

Cf 10:9 According to Ginsberg only ever had the sense ‘to fall asleep’ yet the angel did not ‘wake’ but ‘raised up’ Daniel: cf 8:18; 10:9. Since קְרַצָּר expressed ‘motion towards’, the whole clause read oddly, ‘I fell asleep down to the ground on my face’. The author must have said, ‘I lay down upon my face on the ground’, using Aramaic דִּם, which can mean ‘to lie’ as well as ‘to sleep’. In Hebrew נְפָל should have been used, as it

35 Ginsberg, Studies, 57; 84, note 64a.
36 Ginsberg, Studies, 57-58, (5): Zimmermann, ‘Hebrew’, 204 differed from Ginsberg here: cf
was in v17, and probably in the Aramaic of v17. In v18, he said a different author (from the one in v17) used the Aramaic root שכנך דוכן and should have been employed in Hebrew. He suggested the phrase in Gen 19:1b should have been imitated, where it is written of Lot וַיִּשַׁרְתוּ אפֶּס אֲרָצוּ. Zimmernann accepted this explanation, using it similarly for נַקְנֶה in 10:9.\textsuperscript{37}

8:22 Ginsberg counted as the ‘best single proof’ the fact that הַקְמָלֲנָה and הַקְמַלֲנָה alternate in this verse. He thought הַקְמָלֲנָה corresponded to Aramaic יַקֹּם (though logically it should have been יָקֹם; cf v 8\textsuperscript{38}), and הַקְמַלֲנָה corresponded to Aramaic בִּקְשָׁן. The connections (יַקֹּם : בִּקְשָׁן) were made by a translator: having no preformative to mislead the translator, the first verb was correct. In v 4, וַיַּקְםְו, a masculine plural was substituted for a feminine plural, as in the talmudic practice.\textsuperscript{39}

8:27 Ginsberg considered בַּקָּרֵן meaningless, but thought that it probably represented the Aramaic חַרְבֵּן (cf 3:24 and Ethpaal of חָרֵן in Syriac), meaning ‘I was dazed’; cf 7:28b. He suggested a translator read the word as


\textsuperscript{38} Ginsberg, Studies, 84, note 62.

\textsuperscript{39} Ginsberg, Studies, 56.
or תֹּאַרְתוֹ הַיּוֹרֵה, i.e. one of three Aramaic reflexive conjugations of קָוָה (though he was unsure such stems existed in that root), which could mean ‘I became’. The Aramaic verb was assumed to be equivalent to Niphal of הָדַי (which would be known from e.g. Judg 19:30), and thence the verb in MT.

Zimmermann agreed with Ginsberg here and used a similar solution in 2:1.\textsuperscript{41}

9:1 Ginsberg followed Montgomery in equating תִּפְלַה with Syriac אִמְלָא. He thought the Hebrew should have been vocalised תִּפְלַה, or better as in Aramaic, תִּפְלָה, there being no vowel letter for long Hireq; cf plurals in 5:29; 6:7, 12, 16.

10:3 הָלַהוּ לָא בָּכָה He noted that EVV translate הָלַהוּ as infinitive absolute, but, after Deut 28:40; Mic 6:15; Ezek 16:9; Amos 6:6, Hebrew הָלַהוּ, ‘with oil’ would give the usual idiom. The Peshitta אַתַּנְהַא could be vocalised as wamshaha, ‘and anointing’, equal to ‘at all’ or the Hebrew infinitive absolute. However, the Syriac of the above references suggested a vocalisation wmesha, ‘and (with) oil’, the equivalent of Hebrewוֹמֵשׁ. Ginsberg deduced that MT derived from AramaicVINן מְשָה, where the first word was read נְשָה, equivalent of Hebrewוֹרָר, when it should have been read as לֹא מְשָה, Hebrewוֹמֵשׁ. He noted in support that a fifth century Aramaic papyrus had the exact phrase ואֲנַחַנִּים...מְשָה לָא מְשָה...וֹרָר לָא שָׁויָנִים.\textsuperscript{42}

10:13 יִשָּׂא Ginsberg thought ‘the context cries out’ for the pronoun ‘he’ rather than ‘I’ so a translator must have mistaken רָאָה for רָאָה. His suggested Aramaic was רָאָה רָאָה אֲנַחַנִּים for רָאָה רָאָה אֲנַחַנִּים, ‘the latter has remained’ and the fact that

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Ginsberg, Studies, 58-9; Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 28-9, F.
\textsuperscript{42} Ginsberg, Studies, 60, (9); 85, note 66; A E Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century (1923,
or could be first singular imperfect as well as third masculine singular perfect misled the translator.\(^{43}\)

Similarly, Ginsberg attributed this to a misreading of כָּאֲנָה נַמֵּק, ‘and when I leave’, for רָדֶה נַמֵּק, ‘and when one leaves’\(^{44}\).

Ginsberg reasoned that use of יְצִיר to mean ‘divide (into more than two parts)’ is only found elsewhere in Judg 7:16; 9:43, where it is in a military context. So this verb was not an imitation of the eleventh century language, but arose because יְצִיר in 7:25 corresponded to יְצֵיר in 12:7, and יְצֵיר in 2:41 to יְצִיר. He asserted that in 11:39 it was known יְצֵיר could not mean to ‘distribute’, so יְצִיר, was translated correctly as יְצֵיר (for יְצִיר).
Zimmermann agreed here.\(^{45}\)

Here Ginsberg recognised מִשְׁאֵר was used in Hebrew Daniel where מִשְׁאֵר was in Aramaic, with the sense ‘arise, stand up’, and this characterised LBH, but he argued that it indicated translation from Aramaic when it corresponded to Hebrew מִשְׁאֵר in a scripture quotation! He omitted the last ל of the verse after OG, and traced the quotation to a parody of Isa 7:7, which read מִשְׁאֵר אֵל. He argued that use of מִשְׁאֵר for מִשְׁאֵר in this way was not the type of error that could be made when applying the quotation, even from memory: a Maccabaean translator, not knowing Isa 7:7 by heart, saw the root מִשְׁאֵר in Aramaic and translated it mechanically into מִשְׁאֵר.\(^{46}\)

He considered this ‘unhebraic’ and concluded that it was a

\(^{43}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 60-1, (10).
\(^{44}\) Ibid.
\(^{45}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 61, (11); Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 34, G.
\(^{46}\) Ginsberg, Studies, 56-7, (3).
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literal translation of Aramaic הַרְכָּבָה俱乐部, ‘and both kings’: cf Syriac. 47

12:7 Ginsberg saw in this verb a possible third example of סִמְסִה (ד), to ‘profane’, coupled with an expression for ‘saints’, here זוֹכַרְרַשֶׁ. He argued the sense ‘shattering’ or ‘shatterer’, which refers to military conquest, was inappropriate since Antiochus IV inherited the kingdom from Antiochus III, and he did not conquer the Jews, though he did oppress them. On the basis that elsewhere the verb used for oppression of the saints was סִמְסִה in the Haphel, he suggested the Aramaic verb here was a contracted form of a Haphel participle, זוכַרְרַשֶׁ, which consonantally could also be Qal infinitive, סִמְסִה, another verbal noun meaning ‘dividing, taking apart’. He maintained that Palestinian Aramaic could mean ‘breaking up’, for סִמְסִה had this sense in tannaitic Aramaic, citing S Lieberman Tosefet Rishonim IV, 64 ad II. 32-33. Ginsberg ‘tentatively’ accepted the word order represented by OG, i.e. זוכַרְרַשֶׁ preceding זוכַרְרַשֶׁ. He translated the whole clause, ‘and when the strength of the breaking up of a holy people shall fail’, suggesting that a better translation would be זוכַרְרַשֶׁ המֹרְחֲלָה, ‘desecrater’ for זוכַרְרַשֶׁ. 48

It can be seen from these examples that Ginsberg’s approach was more complex than Zimmermann’s, including recourse to interpretive arguments and sometimes quite extensive emendation of MT. Having taken the stance of accepting Zimmermann’s thesis, his work was more an exploration of Aramaic influence upon the Hebrew text than a presentation of additional proofs to buttress Zimmermann’s evidence, for that which did not depend on emendation was mostly semantic in nature.

H. H. Rowley was unconvinced by Ginsberg’s study and rightly pointed out that semantic evidence does not necessarily point to a translation, since this type of error can be made in a writer’s thinking. 49 Although Ginsberg had shown awareness of this,

47 Ginsberg, Studies, 61, (13).
48 Ginsberg, Studies, 83-3, note 57.
he was too much taken by the theory to be deflected from his assessment of the evidence.\footnote{H L Ginsberg, ‘Two Replies in re My “Studies in Daniel”’, \textit{JBL} 68 (1949),402-7 (406-7).}

Zimmermann himself, while acknowledging Ginsberg’s work as an important landmark in Danielic studies, wrote of him, ‘I cannot follow him completely, however, in his slashing attacks on the Hebrew text, the atomization of sentences, bisection of half verses, and wholesale emendation of words and phrases. I shy away from emending Aramaic texts I have never seen’.\footnote{Zimmermann, \textit{Biblical Books}, 9.}

Nevertheless, Ginsberg served to imaginatively illustrate how some of the difficulties in the MT might be explained in terms of Aramaic and he added some examples to the body of Zimmermann’s evidence which might indicate graphic confusion in Aramaic. These are the occurrences of עָבְדָּה which could be traced to Aramaic root עָבַד read as עָבַד. In addition his view of עַזִּי וּמִי וּזָא נַעֲרָה suggested confusion between גָּזָה and שַׁגִּין.

The Work L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella

Louis F Hartman and Alexander A Di Lella were convinced enough by Ginsberg’s work to write their commentary on the Hebrew text of Daniel, published in 1978, in the light of this theory. Hartman was responsible for the text-critical apparatus, the explanatory notes on the whole text and the commentary on chapters 1 - 9. After the death of Hartman, Di Lella completed the commentary and bibliography and wrote the introduction. The linguistic work was then the responsibility of Hartman, but Di Lella generally supported his stance, though he referred in the introduction to ‘certain acknowledged difficulties with, and perhaps even ad hoc explanations of the theory
that 1:1 - 2:4a and chapters 8 - 12 were originally composed in Aramaic and later translated into the present Hebrew of the MT'.

The influence of Zimmermann and Ginsberg is apparent in the explanatory notes of Hartman. He utilised approximately one third of their combined evidence, but showed a marked preference for the views of Ginsberg, putting that scholar’s major ideas and many of his textual emendations into the footnotes to his English translation, and into his notes. For one example, he accepted Ginsberg’s use of the Aramaic root מָצוּרַע / מַצְוֵר to justify his translation ‘pious one’ for מַעֲשֵׂה. He also used Ginsberg’s emendations to 8:11-13 which were combined with this translation.

Where Ginsberg differed from Zimmermann, Hartman tended to follow the former: so in the dispute as to the semantic range concerning the Aramaic roots דָּרוֹן and דָּלִי in the explanation of הַשָּׁבָל in 8:14, he followed Ginsberg.

This is not to imply that Hartman had no independent view, for, although the amount of completely new evidence put forward by him was relatively small, he added his own observations to some of the material already noted by the previous two scholars. E.g. in 8:5 he regarded מִבְּנֵי הָדִיבוֹר as an Aramaism, as Zimmermann had already remarked, but he expanded the explanation in terms of a mistranslation of הָדִיבּוֹר מַשְׁתָּכְלֶנ. Noting that the Aramaic Hitpaal of שֶבֶל means both to ‘comprehend’ and to ‘consider, observe’, he suggested that a translator attributed the same range of meaning to the Hebrew הָשֵׁבֵל (which takes only the first of those senses), and produced a mistranslation.

---

52 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 15.
53 See pages 96-100, ch 11:31, 38, 39; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 221-2, notes g-g to o-o; 225-6.
54 Cf page 73; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 227.
55 See page 58.
56 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 224.
Hartman’s Additions to the Evidence for the Theory

Since Hartman’s agreements with Ginsberg and Zimmermann, plus his adjustments to their evidence, are easily accessible in the commentary, they will not be listed at this point, but they will be referred to where useful in the detailed study to come. Whilst Hartman did not necessarily claim explicitly that Aramaisms in themselves are evidence of a translation, I have included the ones he observed because they expand the list made by Zimmermann and highlight extra words and phrases that need to be considered.

Aramaisms

8:2  

9:24 כִּשָּׁאָה הַכְּרִיכָה...בִּעֲלֵהֶם הַכְּרִיכָה  57

9:25 מָゲーム, means to ‘cut; decide, decree’, occurring only here in BH but common in Jewish Aramaic.  58

9:25 הַכְּרִיכָה, literally ‘the cut’, i.e. a rock-cut trench, is the only occurrence of the word with this meaning in MT, but it is probably an Aramaism; cf the Zakir Inscription from Apis, A 10 where יָדִיר clearly has this meaning. Akkadian harisu is often used in this sense; cf CAD, Vol 6, 103 b.  59

11:3, 5 כִּמַּשָּׁל stands for normal קִמַּשָּׁל in 1 Chr 26:6 read קִמַּשָּׁל for קִמַּשׁלך.  60

11:20 כִּמַּשָּׁל does not mean ‘not in anger’, where the singular is used; cf Exod 15:8; Prov 30:33. It is a mechanical rendering of the Aramaic כִּמַּשָּׁל; cf Syriac קִמַּש, ‘in the face’, i.e. ‘in public’.  61

This is a good example of calque of an Aramaic idiom in Hebrew.

57 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 223.
58 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 224.
59 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 244-5.
60 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 266.
61 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 269.
11:23 מַמְרְסִים is either a late Hebrew Aramaism or has been taken directly from an original Aramaic text. 62

11:24 מַמְרָשׁ is an Aramaism occurring only in Late Hebrew. He noted the unique use of בָּרוֹר here and in Ps 58:31, concluding the verb is an Aramaism for Hebrew בָּרוּ. Aramaic בָּרוּ, cf Syriac here, occurs in 4:11. The proto-Semitic root was בָּרוּ as in Arabic. 63

11:33 לַעֲבִיס ָ is simply the Aramaic sign of the direct object. 64

11:43 נְקָמִית is a hapax legomenon and an Aramaism from הָכַם, to ‘be hidden’, used frequently in Jewish Aramaic and in Syriac. 65

Additional Suggestions

8:13 מַמְרָשׁ הֵרָבָּה מְלַכָּה Hartman defined מַמְרָשׁ as an ‘Aramaising infinitive’ Peal and not the noun ‘a trampling place’ because another infinitive is required to follow מַמְרָשׁ. He said the word order reflects Aramaic syntax in which the direct object of the infinitive precedes it, and the translator followed the Aramaic mechanically. His suggestion for a probable original was, נְקָמִית יַהֲרָשׁ הָכַם, ‘pious ones’ after Ginsberg. 66

9:2 הָכַם Hartman thought this hybrid form seemed to mean ‘I understood’, but it did not make sense in context, nor did ‘I perceived’ of RSV. He retroverted it to Aramaic אֹשֵׁמֶל which meant both ‘I understood’ and ‘I considered’, and he said the translator understood the wrong sense. 67 Here he identified a calque.

62 Ibid.
63 Ibid. Cf Chapter One, page 37; Chapter Eight, pages 335-6.
64 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 271.
65 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 272; cf Chapter 1, page 23.
66 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 226-7; cf page 114, note 53.
9:23  Cf 9:2 above for the sense of בּוֹלַה: the translation should have read, according to Hartman, ‘mark / consider the answer’.  

11:6  Hartman said נִנְמוּ in the sense of ‘deliver up to death’ was used uniquely for it would normally be followed by לָמוּת; cf Ezek 31:14. He suggested original Aramaic had the root מֵת which meant both to ‘hand over’ and to ‘betray’.  

11:12  נִנְמוּ means ‘and he will not be strong’. Hartman thought the Aramaic was probably מַמְלַכָה, Haphel of מָלַךְ ‘gain possession’. Cf 7:18, 22.  


11:41  נַפֶּלֶת He could find no reason for this word and thought the Aramaic might be נַפֶּל, ‘but’, the Vav having developed from dittography of the previous one. He noted that נַפֶּל was common in MH, usually used after a negative.  

Hartman’s evidence comprised mainly Aramaisms, semantic equivalents, with some calques, but nothing which would appear to be graphic in its source of confusion.  

68 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 239, 244.  
69 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 266.  
70 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 267.  
71 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 270.  
72 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 274.  
73 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 272.
Di Lella's Note on the Greek Text

Di Lella made comment in a footnote on evidence in Theodotion's text of Daniel. This amounted to certain transliterations of Aramaic plurals in 1:3; 10:5; 12:6-7, e.g., ροθομματα for פרתמות in 1:3. He linked these to the Aramaic plural in MT 12:13, ינאית.74

A Reaction to the Theory: the View of J. J. Collins

A recent, though brief, critique of this theory is presented by John J Collins in his commentary on Daniel.75 He allows that 1-2:4a may be a translation from the Aramaic but not 8-12. He considers two aspects of the language of ch 1-2:4a ‘highly compatible’ with the translation theory.

a) Over half76 the Aramaisms in the Hebrew of Daniel occur in ch 1, although the presence of Aramaisms is not necessarily the mark of a translation.

b) The Hebrew of ch 1 may easily be retroverted into Aramaic without recourse to emendation of MT and without assuming misunderstanding of the Aramaic by the translator.

He rejects the translation theory which Ginsberg and Hartman presented regarding chapters 8-12 because it relies heavily on reconstruction of the Hebrew text, assumptions regarding the meaning of the Hebrew, and the translator’s misunderstanding of the ‘original’ Aramaic. He notes that Ginsberg and Hartman drastically change the meaning of the received text without any textual support.

75 Collins, Daniel, 23.
76 This number is from Koch’s list according to Collins, Daniel, note 232.
References to the treatment given by these scholars to 8:11-12 and 11:31, 38 are quoted in support of these criticisms.

Collins also rejects certain evidence which is characteristic of Second Temple Hebrew in general, e.g. the fact that נַכַּל takes on the meaning of מִ רי. He takes refuge in the statement of S R Driver that ‘the author is more at home in Aramaic than in Hebrew’.77 His critique however is only presented on the work of Ginsberg, Hartman and Di Lella, and it includes the same criticism of emendation of MT levelled by Zimmermann himself.78

**Some Observations on the Two Sides**

The three scholars who supported the theory of a translation, whilst agreeing on a body of linguistic evidence, disagreed about method such that Zimmermann could be aligned with Collins in his rejection of Ginsberg’s (and therefore Hartman’s) treatment of MT.

The same three scholars in their linguistic evidence concentrate on the study of chs 8-12. Zimmermann includes in his later work some evidence gathered from 1-2:4a.79 The possibility of this section being originally in Aramaic tended to be put forward as part of a source theory rather than a linguistic theory. Collins, however, is willing to accept that this section may be a translation on the strength of the number of Aramaisms and the retrovertibility of the Hebrew into Aramaic.

Three of Collins’ reasons for rejecting the evidence of Ginsberg and Hartman are good. Firstly, evidence which rests on a hypothetical Hebrew text, i.e. one that has been emended without good textual support, can never constitute proof for a

77 S R Driver, Introduction, lxii.
78 Collins, Daniel, 23; cf page 113.
79 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 10, 15.
translation.80 The Hebrew of the MT is the prime evidence and to emend the text without good text-critical reason is to alter that evidence. This first view was supported by Zimmermann, though he did occasionally emend the text himself.81

Secondly, the theory cannot be demonstrated by recourse to particular interpretation or meaning of the Hebrew text which might be contested.82 Also, special care has to be taken when reconstructing the history of the Jews as represented in Daniel in line with the book of Maccabees: they are two separate witnesses and changing one to conform to the other must have a strong justification. It seems better, in a linguistic study, to utilise a reasonable sense with due regard for the context, with appeal to historical interpretation only where necessary to elucidate the meaning. The apocalyptic nature of the material in chs 8-12, in which symbolism is mixed with reality, and the style is deliberately opaque, often makes the precise meaning difficult to distil from the text, and this has to be borne in mind.

Thirdly, Collins must be correct to reject general characteristics of late Hebrew, such as the use of עָנָל for וֹדֵד, as constituting any kind of proof for a translation. Hartman at least was aware of some of the similarities of the Hebrew of Daniel with Mishnaic Hebrew,83 though he still accepted the theory of a translation from Aramaic.

Collins’ other criticism, that the theory rests on assuming misreadings of an Aramaic original, has less justification for reasons which shall be enlarged upon.

Collins accepted that 1-2:4a could be translated from Aramaic, firstly, on the number of Aramaisms in the text. This reasoning can be contested, as will be shown in

---

80 This is not to suggest that textual emendation has no value at all in attempts to understand a difficult Hebrew text, but the point is that a conjecturally emended text is always totally hypothetical and it cannot constitute textual proof: if the emendation is found to have support in a version, it becomes a variant reading and is no longer completely hypothetical.
81 Cf pages 76 (on 11:18), 82 (on 11:4), 94 (on 11:38).
82 Collins, Daniel, 23, contests the evidence in some detail.
83 Cf Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 244, on 9:24 וֹדֵד, the best example; cf 243, 9:21; 272, 11:41.
Aramaisms', below. His second point, that the text is easily retrovertible into Aramaic (presumably relative to the longer section of Hebrew in Daniel which is more difficult to retrovert), may be true, but how many other Biblical texts, especially in LBH, might fall into this category?

With regard to Collins’ stance on this issue, Driver’s statement does not provide an alternative to a translation theory. To comment that the writer of the Hebrew chapters was more at home in the Aramaic language is to make no judgment as to whether the writer was an author or a translator, though Driver assumed the former.

The Likelihood of a Translation

The theory that the Hebrew of Daniel represents a translation rather than a composition had been suggested, prior to the work of Zimmermann, as part of general source theory. The bi-lingual nature of the book has given rise to diverse theories, some of which suggest either the original of the whole text was Hebrew and the Aramaic sections represent a translation or vice versa. Whilst there is currently little overall agreement in this area, it must be noted that the bi-lingual text is the primary factor in pointing to the likelihood that part of the book of Daniel is translation rather than composition.

That the Hebrew text, rather than the Aramaic, is more likely to qualify as the translation is suggested because of the quality of the language: the Aramaic sections are generally accepted as well-written, mostly in fluent narrative prose, whereas the Hebrew is, in the first section, characterised by Aramaisms and, in the second, larger section, by the type of problems already described in Chapter One.

84 Cf pages 127-8.
85 The question is not further addressed in this study, but that is not to suggest that an exploration of the issue of retrovertibility would not be useful. It is simply an open question because Collins made an assumption without evaluating evidence of a wider scope than Daniel.
86 Cf Collins, Daniel, 26-8, which culminates in his own conclusions.
These two items by no means constitute proof that the Hebrew is translation, but they are the initial pointers that directed scholars to examine the text for detailed evidence that might lead to proof.

The Question of Proof

Zimmermann recognised that such evidence must be linguistic in nature, if it is to be as objective as possible and not influenced by source theories in particular. The fact that Ginsberg and Hartman accepted his theory and built upon it with a method which was unsound, in that it entailed those practices objected to by Collins, does not alter the broad integrity of his first approach to the issue. The question of what may be accepted as linguistic proof, indeed, whether such proof is attainable, remains.

a) Translation and Error

In search of a sound method, it is necessary to look at general linguistic principles and to consider firstly, what is translation? In essence, it is the transference of text from a source language to a target language, but this process takes place in the mind. The source and target languages involved may be in any of three mediums; phonetic, i.e. speech; graphic, i.e. writing; mental, i.e. thought, but the third medium is essential in the process. Translation may take place entirely in the mind without any recourse to either phonetic or graphic expression; but translation of text from phonetic or graphic mediums to phonetic or graphic mediums always involves transference to thought where the essential process takes place, and thought always intervenes between graphic and / or phonetic expressions of text in source and target languages.

A meaningful text always originates in the mind and may be expressed graphically and /or phonetically, or it may remain without external expression in the mind. In ancient

---


88 Modern machine translation, where a computer takes the place of the human mind, does not negate this principle.
times texts were preserved over time in either of two ways, graphically in manuscripts, engravings and the like, and mentally in memory. The possible theoretical permutations of a translation process were therefore great, even in ancient times. The following list comprises only the simplest ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>TL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graphic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>graphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>phonetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonetic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonetic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>phonetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonetic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>graphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>graphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>phonetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such representations of the translation process cannot indicate passage of time, which could vary from seconds to years!

The ancient practice of reading a manuscript aloud before (copying or ) translating the text is an example of a more complex sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>TL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graphic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>phonetic</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>graphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a translator working from a manuscript expressed the text in the TL verbally before writing it, the sequence of interaction between the mediums is even more complicated:

\[89\] Of course, electronic preservation of texts in phonetic and graphic form are not relevant to the discussion of translation of texts in ancient times, but only to modern translations.
If an author thought in a source language but wrote in a target language, a complex sequence would have been enacted, especially if verbalisation took place in the translation process.

A truly bi-lingual person may think in both languages, but in the case of Hebrew Daniel competence may be assumed to be quite low in the target language, following Driver’s opinion of the writer.

These sequences are rather inadequate for indicating the true place of memory in translation, for it must be involved at any point where thought is utilised; but the above serve to emphasis two basic points. Firstly translation from SL in one ancient manuscript to TL in another was a complicated process involving the visual, aural and mental. Secondly, both types of writer, the author writing in a second language and the translator were actually translating text. With this in mind, Driver’s view on the Hebrew writer of Daniel may be paraphrased: ‘the writer of Hebrew Daniel was translating from an original Aramaic text in his mind, for he thought in Aramaic, and as his Hebrew was not good, his Aramaic influenced his translation’. Whereas the view of Zimmermann and his colleagues would have to be paraphrased: ‘the writer of Hebrew Daniel was translating from an Aramaic manuscript, and as Aramaic was his first language and his Hebrew was not good the Aramaic greatly influenced his translation’.

In determining whether a document is a composition or a translation, in the absence of any reliable external evidence, the language of the document must be the primary
evidence. However quality of language cannot differentiate between an author or a translator as is shown by the following commonplace observations.

1) A person proficient in a second language may be capable of producing both an excellent composition and an excellent translation, i.e. a good translation equivalence, in that language.

2) In the same way, a person who is not proficient in a second language may produce either a composition or a translation that has imperfections or errors of various sorts.

3) An excellent translation will be indistinguishable from a composition, so that it will be linguistically undetectable as a translation.

4) A translation will only be linguistically detectable if it contains imperfections or errors.

5) The errors made by a poor linguist in a second language, in both composing and translating, are likely to be similar with regard to use of vocabulary, semantics and syntax.

These five points might indicate that it is not possible to distinguish between a translation and a composition. However the following must also be taken into account.

6) A composition in a second language may be constrained in the language employed by the subject matter of the composition and the proficiency of the writer, but there is, nevertheless, some freedom for the author, to choose vocabulary and expressions commensurate with his/her proficiency, and may even influence the choice of content.

7) Translating may be more difficult than composing in that the translator is constrained by the source text: the writer is ‘put on the spot’ because the element of
choice in vocabulary and expressions is limited by the content of a text which the translator cannot influence.

8) A translator has an additional task above that of an author, reading and understanding a manuscript, before mentally interpreting it and committing the interpretation to writing.

These three statements might suggest that a translator is more likely to make forced errors than an author, but it would be unsafe to reason that the greater the number of errors, the more likely the text is to be a translation. There are too many variables that could apply, in specific cases, regarding the subject of the text, the type of text and the languages involved: e.g. an author might be required to write about a subject in a language that has very little vocabulary about that subject (cf section on aramaisms, page 127). However the above three points are additional reasons why errors ought to be accepted as evidence of translation.

Taking all these statements it must be allowed that the hope of detecting translation in a document rests upon the occurrence of imperfections or errors in the language. Since an author and a translator can make similar linguistic mistakes, those errors which are evidence of a translation only, must derive from the task which only the translator executes, that of reading and understanding a manuscript. It would be surprising if the errors common to both were totally absent in a translation: but, for a translation to be probable, the cumulative evidence must include errors which can only have their origin in the reading of a written text in the source language. The author had a text in mind which he / she understood and did not mistake, but may have found difficult to turn into the target language: for the translator the pitfalls in reading a particular hand-written manuscript and understanding the intended meaning of the author could be great.

For this reason it would seem to be unreasonable for Collins to wholly reject misunderstanding of an original Aramaic as evidence for a translation. He may reject
the evidence of semantic misunderstanding, as Rowley correctly did, but misunderstanding which may have its source in reading manuscript is the only evidence so far isolated as capable of proving linguistically that an ancient text is a translation. It must further be noted, what is well known from the variable condition of the Hebrew of MT itself, that any text which has been transmitted manually can become to some degree or other corrupted by scribal errors, marginal corrections, glosses, conflation and the like. If Daniel 8-12 has been transmitted as such in Aramaic and later translated into Hebrew, there should be evidence of scribal errors and other corruptions of a graphic sort that are traceable to Aramaic rather than Hebrew, just as problems in LXX can be traced to the underlying Hebrew.

For this study concern is with errors in reading and understanding an Aramaic text which is necessarily only accessible from retroversion of Hebrew Daniel. The two languages concerned in this context, Hebrew and Aramaic, are cognate languages, sharing the same script, being consonantal in character, that is with few graphic indications of the vowels. The textual corruptions in them will therefore be similar in type.

With all these observations in mind, the evidence put forward for the translation hypothesis of the Hebrew chapters of Daniel will be examined.

**b) Aramaisms**

Collins is willing to accept the evidence of Aramaisms in ch 1-2:4a is compatible with the theory that this section is a translation from Aramaic. This raises the question as to why Aramaisms, in particular the number of them, indicate a translation in a given text. Their use may depend on the nature and subject matter of the text, which influences the type of Aramaisms employed. The first Hebrew section in Daniel is a narrative concerning life in a foreign court and it is possible that technical language needed to describe such a life was not available in Hebrew. This would equally have
been a problem for an author and a translator. It might even be argued that a high number of Aramaisms is more indicative of a composition than a translation, because a translator, by the very nature of the work involved, would be concerned not to use the source language but to turn it into the target language, possibly even at the expense of clarity. This may be to raise hypothetical questions, which are unanswerable, concerning the precise constraints on given writers; nevertheless, the weakness in Collins’ reasoning is apparent.

It must further be asked, what are defined as Aramaisms by Collins and do any specific types indicate a translator at work? The term generally denotes all characteristics of language in Hebrew that have their source in Aramaic. Collins rejects some Aramaisms, being characteristic of Late Biblical Hebrew, as indicative of a translation90 but he accepts Persian loan-words in ch 1. The term Aramaism may indicate adoption of Aramaic vocabulary (including Aramaised loanwords), meaning, syntax or morphology. None of these per se is necessarily evidence of a translation since they may equally be used by an author and a translator, because they can also be evidenced in spoken language (and of course in thought language because that is where they originate!).

Zimmermann conceded the point that Aramaisms were not proof of translation, but he included certain words thus labelled as part of his cumulative evidence. In this way he consigned the majority of his own evidence as inadmissible without realising it, because the greater part of it consisted of Aramaisms of one sort or another.

c) Semantic Range

Zimmermann compared the semantic range of some words in the Hebrew text of Daniel 8-12 and probable Aramaic counterparts and he noted that, where the Aramaic carried (at least) two meanings but the semantic range of the Hebrew carried only one of them, the other meaning of the Aramaic was often more appropriate to the
Hebrew context. In these instances he assumed that a translator had chosen the wrong meaning, but he did not question how a translator could have made such a choice when the second meaning would so obviously provide a better translation.

Ginsberg and Hartman explained the same phenomenon in terms of misunderstanding an Aramaic original, confusion between Aramaic and Hebrew, and even textual corruption in the Hebrew, but under the influence of Zimmermann, they did not question the writer's understanding of Hebrew.

In many examples semantic borrowing and various forms of calque are simple explanations for the perceived problem in the Hebrew text: i.e. the semantic range of an Aramaic word has been (in most cases probably wrongly) attributed to a Hebrew word. This explanation removes the necessity of assuming misunderstanding of Aramaic by the writer, but it does consider the writer's comprehension of Hebrew to be deficient. It upholds Driver's opinion of the writer's ability as accepted by Collins.

The presence of calque in a text is not proof of a translator at work, but as a type of aramaism it may be considered part of the cumulative evidence which could point in that direction.\(^9^1\) It has its own value in providing explanation for some of the difficulties in the Hebrew text. Whether a particular calque was a permanent fixture in the language of the time, or whether it was unique to the writer of Hebrew Daniel cannot necessarily be determined. Neither can we be certain whether they were deliberate or accidental.\(^9^2\)

\(^9^0\) Collins, Daniel, 26-8.


\(^9^2\) Silva, Biblical Words, 90 and note 43, follows Hope in viewing calque as deliberate and entailing some linguistic skill, rather than mere error. In this study the term will be used for both types because the distinction is not as important as that between semantic and graphic confusions.
d) Syntax

Syntactical errors, e.g. the erratic use of the definite article, like semantic errors, may be made in thought, speech and writing, by an author or a translator. Unless such errors can be traced to a possible graphic ambiguity in Aramaic, they remain only part of the cumulative evidence of the Aramaic influence upon the text.93

e) Morphology

The examples of Aramaic morphology listed in Chapter One94 are insignificant, for many of them could easily be the result of scribal error. Other explanations can nonetheless be explored as part of the search for cumulative evidence. Aramaic morphology could have influenced the Hebrew, as Zimmermann suggested with בּוֹשֵׁב,95 but it is difficult to see why either of these two phenomena should be considered direct or certain evidence for a translation as opposed to a composition.

f) Stereotyped Expression

Zimmermann seemed to be adducing style as an evidence of translation when he included a section on ‘Standard and Stock Translations which Conveyed Wooden and Misleading Renditions of Aramaic’.96 These traits, like semantic and syntactic evidence, can be characteristic of either an author or a translator. The same is true of Hebrew phrases and words which are obviously quotations from other biblical books (or from underlying Aramaic sources such as well-known proverbs). An author could have used these because they seemed appropriate, and likewise a translator might have employed an expression which was familiar because the underlying Aramaic

93 R A Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents* (SCS 3,1974, Cambridge Mass, SBL), has produced a skillful analysis of the Acts of the Apostles and has demonstrated that the earlier chapters are semitised Greek and the later are not, on the basis of syntax. He is unable to be specific as to whether they are written or verbal sources, or even if the evidence denotes two different authors whose thought patterns were linguistically different.
94 Cf pages 22-3.
95 Cf page 58. Cf page 171 for discussion of Aramaic plural endings in Hebrew.
96 Cf Chapter Two, pages 80-4.
suggested it. There may have been Hebraisms in the Aramaic, just as there are Aramaisms in the Hebrew. These phenomena are all neutral for the translation thesis because they cannot be adduced as proof in either direction.

**g) Evidence for a Written Aramaic Text**

Evidence which suggests a written Aramaic text underlying the Hebrew is crucial to the consideration of whether the Hebrew is translation. Those who support the translation theory have supplied several examples of how the some of the Hebrew can be explained in terms of error in reading an Aramaic written account. It has been argued that erroneous readings cannot be ruled out as evidence for a translation, that indeed, they are the one type of evidence that can with any certainty indicate a translation.

The potential mistakes in reading an Aramaic text are similar in nature to those in reading Hebrew, stemming mainly from the ambiguity of an unpointed text and the possible confusion of consonants of similar form. They include all errors which a translator or a copyist could have made in reading a manuscript, which are the stuff of textual criticism.

The difficulty with this type of evidence is clearly that any underlying Aramaic can only be hypothetical (though, of course, unlike the hypothetical nature of an amendment to the Hebrew text, it can at least be said to be based on the actual Hebrew text). For this reason, examples of problems seemingly solved by retroversion need to be carefully weighed against other explanations for the Hebrew reading.

Thus far, based on the work of Zimmermann and Ginsberg, it is convenient to typify four possible kinds of evidence for an underlying Aramaic written text.
i) There is Hebrew in MT which can be traced to ambiguity in a consonantal Aramaic text: examples of this are provided by Zimmermann’s evidence in his 1975 section F which I have noted under the title ‘Written Text’, plus his 1975 section D concerned with the ambiguous Aramaic particle ם. 97

ii) There is also Hebrew which may be traced to a common text-critical error in an Aramaic text: here may be cited Ginsberg’s observations on the vagaries of the root מתי in the Hebrew, which could be traced to confusion between מתי and יבב in Aramaic. 98

iii) There is one example where the difference between MT and a variant in a Hebrew manuscript can be traced to an underlying ambiguous Aramaic text. This is in 11:17 מותשתיתה, ‘to destroy her / it’, has been recognised as an error for ‘to destroy him’. Zimmermann was the first to suggest that this difference might be traced to the ambiguity in the gender of the Aramaic third singular pronominal suffix. He did so before the reading of 4QDan ⁵, מותשתיתה, came to light. In this example, the theoretical Aramaic reading provides the ambiguity which could have caused the divergence in the Hebrew manuscripts. 99

iv) There are two examples adduced by Zimmermann where the semantic difference between MT and LXX can be accounted for by either semantic ambiguity or a text-critical error in an Aramaic text: here the difference in MT נצחק and LXX καθαρίσθησαι in 8:14 is cited 100 and the readings MT מותשתית, OG ου κατα την ἀλήθην αὐτοῦ in 11:4. 101

97 Cf pages 67-8, 78-80.
98 Cf pages 100-2, 106.
99 Cf pages 86-7.
100 Cf page 73.
101 Cf pages 82-4.
To summarise, evidence for a written Aramaic text underlying the Hebrew of Daniel would include all those features characteristic of a composition made by a writer whose first language was Aramaic and who made errors in the Hebrew, i.e. Aramaic vocabulary, syntax and idioms and calque: this evidence must, however, exclude general features of LBH which owe their existence to Aramaic influence.\(^\text{102}\)

Essential for inclusion would be additional features whose existence in the text can be traced only to a problem in reading a hypothetical underlying Aramaic text.

Features which point to Aramaic underlying both MT and a variant reading in a Hebrew manuscript or LXX may be extra support for the translation theory, but they are not essential to it. So far there are only a few examples, but were others to be found, this would of course raise important questions for textual transmission and for the study of the LXX of Daniel beyond the scope of this study.

Despite weaknesses in the work of Zimmermann and Ginsberg, the broad scope of the evidence put forward by them does fit this picture of evidence for a translation from Aramaic. The evidence of a graphic nature is admittedly thin and needs critical appraisal, and the question also arises as to how much evidence must be found in this section to convince any competent scholar that it is more than simple coincidence. Yet there is still a body of evidence there which, as Baumgartner maintained, requires serious consideration.\(^\text{103}\)

\(^\text{102}\) Although Zimmermann did expand his theory of translation from Aramaic to include other LBH books such as Chronicles, Ezra and Esther, using categories similar to those in his study of Daniel, this work must be regarded as a separate theory for each book, each far from proven. Any Aramaic influence they have in common with Daniel may be general characteristics of a type of Hebrew in use, probably after Aramaic was adopted as a spoken language of the Jews in general, and those which are unique to each book must each be judged on their own merit.

\(^\text{103}\) Baumgartner, ‘Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel’, \textit{ZAW} 45 (1927), 81-133 (75, note 1).
Towards a Sound Method

The focus of the study is the search for errors in reading an Aramaic Vorlage, and to this end:

1. The general approach must avoid as much as possible *a priori* judgments regarding the translation theory itself and interpretation of the text. The tendencies of Zimmermann and Ginsberg in this direction have to be avoided.

2. The text for study is the unamended / unemended MT, but informed by Qere readings, and variants with textual support.

3. A thorough text-critical study is the essential work, to find Hebrew textual solutions to weigh against evidence for an Aramaic substratum.

4. The cumulative evidence may then be judged as to how strongly or otherwise it supports the hypothesis that MT is Hebrew translated from Aramaic.

With regard to a level of error that may be thought permissible in the hypothetical Aramaic text, it is useful to take Driver’s observation as a guide: if the writer was more at home in Aramaic than in Hebrew, errors in the reading of an Aramaic text might be allowed to the same level as a text-critic may find in the copying or translating of a Hebrew text; but in the use of Hebrew language a higher degree of error may be allowed.
Chapter Four

Text-critical Evidence and that Put Forward by Ginsberg for a Written Aramaic Text

Two Graphic Similarities

Tav with Vav and Nun

Attention is drawn to the graphic resemblance between the consonant Tav and the two letters, Vav followed by Nun. Firstly this is apparent from simple observation of scripts, particularly in the archaic and archaising styles,\(^1\) where the ligature is possible in both medial and final forms. Tav as final radical in a word, with its elongated second vertical stroke could be confused visually with Vav and final Nun, if the Tav's strokes were not properly connected, or if the Vav and Nun were too closely aligned. This is also true of medial Tav, and Vav followed by medial Nun.\(^2\)

Secondly, an example of this confusion can be traced in a variant of P967 in Dan 11:24b. Here MT reads יַעֲרָבָא, OG has εἰς ματὴν, but Papyrus 967 εἰς ἀμαρτίαν which represents Hebrew יַעֲרָבָא, for יַעֲרָבָא is a standard equivalent of ἀμαρτία.\(^3\) The OG reading may be an inner Greek error or a further corruption of the Hebrew from יַעֲרָבָא to יַעֲרָבָא, which is one Hebrew equivalent of ματὴν.\(^4\)

Since Tav, Vav, and Nun can each be mistaken for other letters, it follows that other patterns of ligature probably occurred. Weiss has given a number examples of Mem

\(^1\) See e.g. Cross, ‘The Development’, 137, lines 4, 6; 138, line 2. The early semi-cursive, 148, line 2, also displays the potential for this graphic confusion.

\(^2\) The use of final forms co-existed for some time with the continuance of the medial forms at the ends of words: see Naveh, The Development, 46. 26; Tov, Textual Criticism, 210; Cross, ibid.

\(^3\) Cf Geissen, Papyrus 967, 256; HRp 62-5. For confusion of יַעֲרָבָא with יַעֲרָבָא cf also page 340, note 177.

\(^4\) HRp 899.
confused with Nun followed by Vav, Nun followed by Yod, and even Yod followed by Vav. It is likely therefore that other ligatures involved the likeness of Tav to various pairs of letters, e.g. cf BA of Daniel 4:33.

**Ayin with Yod**

For some centuries in the Jewish script both Ayin and Yod were small letters and could have been easily confused if written carelessly or if the medium was defective in some way. This is particularly apparent in a cursive script and not impossible even in a square Palestinian script. An example may be found in the reading of

---

5 Weiss, ‘On Ligatures’, 184-196, especially p 188, footnote 4. Cases in point are occurrences of γίγα or χαρά in LXX where MT reads מַחֲרָה, described by E Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (1999, Leiden, Brill), 206-7. Tov lists them as contextual guesses or exegetical traditions, but concedes in note 4, 'It is not impossible that the graphic similarity of מַחֲרָה and מַדְרָה somehow influenced the present reading’. Examples he gives are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jer 9:20 (21)</td>
<td>בַּרְאֵשׁ</td>
<td>LXX εἰς τὴν γῆν ἴμων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos 3:9</td>
<td>עַל אָרָמִית</td>
<td>LXX χαράς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos 3:10</td>
<td>עָלָמִית</td>
<td>LXX ταῖς χαράς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos 3:11</td>
<td>אָרָמִית</td>
<td>LXX τοις χαράς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic 5:4 (5)</td>
<td>בַּרְאֵשׁ</td>
<td>LXX ἐπὶ τὴν χαράν ἴμων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the light of Weiss’s evidence, these are indeed best understood as graphic confusions with forms of מַדְרָה, more particularly between Resh and Dalet, and Nun-Vav and Mem. In Jer 9:20 MT seems to have the correct sense for the context, so Nun-Vav was lost after Mem to give מַדְרָה in the LXX Vorlage; but in Mic 5:4, the form מַדְרָה which underlies τῆν χαράν ἴμων is more likely to be correct because the parallel is מַדְרָה. In Amos 3:9-10 the MT readings suit the context, but in v 11 it could be either text. For מַדְרָה (with or without suffix), which underlies LXX in these references, either the same mix-ups happened and vowel letter Vav was added later to make the plural forms, or only the Nun fell out.

6 See Dan 4:33 וּרְדָד where θ reads ἡλθὼν which according to BHS, after Behrm according to BDB 1089, corresponds to וּרְדָד, and V has a couplet, decoremque perveni. There must have been a dittography of the conjunction following, which, in ligature with Yod of וּרְדָד, formed a Tav to produce the verb וּרְדָד. The difficulties which Ulrich experienced in reading the Qumran fragments also included the occasional ligature: see e.g. Ulrich, ‘Daniel’ Pt 1, 24, line 8 (1:20), an Aleph, Ayin or Kaph-Vav; 27, 2:31 (3 i 16) וּרְדָד / וּרְדָד; 30, Line 17 (4:29), upper left arm of Mem with final Nun.

7 If letters were sub-linear, as in Qumran practice, i.e. the scribes wrote their letters as if hung from a guidance line, and Ayin and Yod did not extend as far down from it as the average consonant, they might be described as short letters. Ayin, of course, later became conventionally as long as the average, and in some hands Yod was elongated and therefore could be confused with Vav et al.

8 Cf Cross, ‘The Development’, in footnote 1, above.

9 Cf Birnbaum, ‘The Hebrew’ Pt 1, 128, 144.
Two Variant Readings Showing Possible Evidence of an Aramaic Vorlage

The two variant readings in ch 11 are set out before the comparison between the text-critical study and the four kinds of evidence for a written Aramaic text adduced by, firstly, Ginsberg and, secondly, Zimmermann, as summarised on pages 131-132.

11:6  MT  יִהְתֹּר תַּחַת קָנָן תַּחַת קָנָן יִהְתֹּר תַּחַת קָנָן יִהְתֹּר תַּחַת קָנָן
θ  συμμειγήσονται καὶ θυγατὴρ βασιλεῶς τον νοτοῦ εἰσελθονταὶ πρὸς βασιλέα τοῦ βορρᾶ
S  foederabuntur filiaque regis austri veniet ad regem aquilonis
V  foederabuntur filiaque regis austri veniet ad regem aquilonis

OG & 967  ἀνεῖ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐισελθονται βασιλεὺς Αἰγυπτοῦ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τὴν βορρᾶ
Syh  לָשׁוּב אֵלָה לֵבָּת בָּנָה בָּנָה בָּנָה בָּנָה

In this text both OG and MT have their usual support, but OG is substantially different from MT in that it reads ‘he led them’ rather than ‘they made an alliance’. Moreover, it has no reference to the daughter of the king of the south (Egypt), and the subject of the verb ‘will go in’ becomes the king of the south himself instead of his daughter. Lastly, the OG has the sense ‘the kingdom of the north’ instead of ‘the king of the north’.

10 Ulrich, ‘Daniel’ Pt 2, 22-3. The lower hook of Lamed was also written ‘short’ in this period, but Lamed is a much more difficult letter to mistake for either Yod or Ayin because of its long upper stroke which protrudes above the top line of the other consonants. Nevertheless this confusion did
Most commentators ignore these textual problems with the OG, and concentrate on those that occur later in the verse. Only Montgomery, followed by Collins, has a suggestion, that ἦξετι is an internal error for συντάξετι because in v 23 the infinitive διδεῖν is rendered in OG by συντάξετος. This however does not explain the pronoun which follows the Greek verb, nor the absence of reference to the daughter of the king of the south from the text.

**Hebrew Solution**

A Hebrew text-critical solution is not easy to find as the following retroversion of the OG to Hebrew shows when compared to MT:

\[
\text{OG > Heb: } \text{נְכָרִים} \text{ נַכְלָה} \text{ יַבְעָשׁ} \text{ אַל-מַעְלָה} \text{ הָעָפְרוּן} \]  

\[
\text{MT: } \text{יְהַבְּרֶז} \text{ בֵּית} \text{ נַכְלָה} \text{ הָעָפְרוּן} \text{ כְּלָת} \text{ הָעָפְרוּן}
\]

There are a number of possibilities to choose from in rendering ἦξετι into Hebrew but the alternatives shown above, though not exhaustive, would seem to be the best options. The root נַכְלָה was chosen in preference to נַכְלָה and נַכְלָה because the consonants of the Hiphil, which can mean ‘lead’, seemed to offer the greatest hope of a match with נַכְלָה: Resh is in both verbs, and Dalet and Kaph are consonants that are known to be fairly commonly mistaken for others, such as Het and Bet respectively. The Hiphil verb with a pronoun instead of a pronoun suffix offers the closest parallel as far as number of consonants, there being nine in each of

---

12 Cf Ps 107:7
Yet it is not easy to describe the stages that might have produced the difference between the two texts. It would require the transposition of Resh from fifth to third radical (or vice versa), and the corruption and transposition of other letters, possibly Bet corrupted to Kaph and transposed from fourth to fifth consonant.

Root נזות might provide an alternative equivalent of the OG reading because in the Hiphil it would provide a radical Het as in the MT verb. Nun would replace Tav in the verb and after this there is little in common except that, if the pronoun אָנָה is again assumed, it gives a greater number of consonants and perhaps a Tav to parallel that in MT בְּתֵר, where the final Mem could be a dittography of the one in מלחֵר.

Besides these difficulties, the Hebrew equivalent of OG, with the king as the subject, requires a masculine prefix in the verb אָנָה rather than the feminine in MT אָנָה, and this change must be accounted for.

It may be possible to explain the change from מֶלֶךְ to מֶלֶכְתָּה in Hebrew. The additional consonants ה... which underlie the Greek text could be explained if Tav arose as a corrupt dittography of ה, the definite article in fiדמנָנ of MT, and the Vav was a later, additional mater lectionis.

Aramaic Solution

A text-critical solution to the variants in this section of v 6 as a whole is easier to find in Aramaic.

---

14 The synonym דְּמַלְכָה did not seem to offer a better solution than מֶלֶכְתָּה.

15 Cf De Rossi, Variae, 150, on Dan 11:33 where one manuscript reads דָּמָרְב for דָּמָרְב.
1) The root דְּבָר provides a close graphic likeness to דִּבְרָה since only the loss of one vertical stroke is required for Het to resemble Dalet.16

2) In the Aramaic retroverted from MT it is easy to visualise the loss of Bet and Resh in דָּבָר, by parablepsis from the sequence of letters דָּבָר. Additionally, a ligature of Vav and Nun resembles Tav, so the sequence of consonants could have appeared as דָּבָר and confusion in reading or copying these might explain not only how the term for ‘daughter’ was lost but also how the Greek pronoun αὐτῶν arose.

a. It is possible that Tav, left from דָּבָר after the loss of Bet and Resh, plus Nun at the end of the imperfect plural verb gave rise to נְנֶ... third masculine plural pronominal suffix to the verb,17 and Vav of the plural verb was lost in the confusion. However, this pronoun suffix is characteristic of TA and it may not have been in use at the time of Daniel’s early transmission.

16 The example in 2 Sam 13:39 where the Lucianic Greek, among others, supplies the correct reading indicating Hebrew דִּבְרָה for MT דָּבָר, illustrates this. See BHS; H P Smith, A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel (ICC, 1899, Edinburgh, T & T Clark), 333; S R Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel (2nd edn, 1913), 305.

17 The consonant Resh could have given rise to Nun: Tov, Text-critical Use, 139 supplies an example of this interchange from Hos 12:1, where MT reads יָּנִּי but LXX has κακάποιεται which witnesses to the form רָמַדַּי.
b. It may be that the sheer number of vertical strokes presented in a retroversion from MT נָבָרְרָהּ בֶּןִי gave rise to a corruption דֵּבָרְתָּ וּסְלָחְתָּ or some clause with a form of independent third, masculine plural pronoun used as the accusative. The most probable form of the latter would be דָּמָן, since Mem could have arisen from Bet, or a ligature of Bet and Resh, and He may have been formed from ligatures of two Vavs or Vav and Nun. הָלָן in דָּמָן would again be a misreading of the final Tav.

c. The pronoun may be a secondary Hebrew development after 1) and 2) in Aramaic. The necessary Mem for a third masculine plural pronominal suffix in Hebrew is possible as a misreading of Tav, or a reduplication of Mem in מַלְכַּל as noted above.

d. There is always the possibility that, after the corruptions of the verb from דֵּבָרְתָּ to דֵּבָרְרָהּ and the loss of הָלָן, the Greek translator added the pronoun to smooth the sense.

The most likely answer to the problem of the pronoun is in section b.

3) The discrepancy of gender in the verb meaning ‘will go to / into’ is the same in Aramaic as in Hebrew. In either language the feminine preformative, Tav, could have become defective and therefore read as Yod. It is less likely that a Yod evolved into Tav, unless it was under the influence of the preceding letter, which in a Hebrew text like MT would have been Bet from בֵּנִי. However, if the Vorlage of OG had the equivalent of ‘Egypt’ rather than ‘king of the south’ a better solution is apparent since either Mem of מְלָכָיו or Yod, Nun of מְלָכָיו provide a better resemblance to Tav than Bet. Visual examination of most scripts thus far cited would suggest that the

---

18 BA has מְלָכָיו in Ezra and מְלָכָיו in Daniel, plus one occurrence of מְלָכָיו in Dan 3:12; cf Ros 19, # 29; 20 # 31. QA has all the forms retroverted above: see E M Cook, ‘Qumran Aramaic and Dialectology’, SQA, 11, # 5.&6.

19 More than one ligature in the word suggests that Vavs were formed with more pronounced hooks than average, which would make them more susceptible to ligature. He in מְלָכָיו may have been formed from two Vavs, after the final Nun of the verb had been lost.
latter is the easiest error and so the change to suffixed Yod from Tav was most probable in Aramaic.

4) An explanation for the development of חַלְלֵה from לֹלֵל is not obvious, though the alternative construction דֶּר חַלְלֵה offers a possibility as the source of a corruption since there are more consonants to be considered. דֶּר could have given rise to Tav if the down-stroke of Yod was extended too far, but the corruption of Aleph into Vav is a less likely phenomenon.

Points 1) and 2) are strong reasons to suspect that textual error in an Aramaic Vorlage gave rise to the variant readings of OG here. Points 3) and 4) suggest Aramaic answers are better than those explored in a search for textual error in Hebrew. Only in point 5) may Aramaic be thought to offer a less satisfactory answer to the textual problem than Hebrew.

11:31  MT יָכֶֽרֶדנָ֑תְקִנְמוּת S הֶרֶדּ שַׁפְּרָן הָֽעִוֹת 0 Το Αγιασμα της δυναστειας V sanctuarium fortitudinis

OG Το άγιον του φοβου Syh הָֽעִוְתָּה הַכָּרְדֶנָ֑תְקִנְמוּת

Ginsberg retroverted this phrase to מָכַר יִרְדָּנָ֑תְקִנְמוּת and Zimmermann to יִרְדָּנָ֑תְקִנְמוּת but neither attempted to explain the OG reading in their solution. Four out of six readings witness to a genitive relationship between the two nouns: a reading with two nouns in apposition in MT is supported by the Peshitta. OG is supported by

20 This remains true despite the example of Ulrich’s solution to a problem in 11:17; cf page 160-1.
21 Cf pages 104, 105 respectively.
the Syro-Hexapla, but it has a curious reading meaning ‘sanctuary of fear’. Theodotion and the Vulgate stand between the two sets of readings, each showing a phrase with genitive relationship, meaning, ‘sanctuary of strength’.

It might be argued, because of the weighting, four witnesses against two, that the genitive relationship is original and that the definite article on the first noun in MT is an accretion which later altered the grammar of the two nouns, so that they had to be read in apposition. It might even be conjectured that the first article could be the vestigial remains of הָרוּת, indicating a direct object, where Aleph has dropped out and Tav has become He, though the sign of the direct object is frequently lacking in the Hebrew of Daniel. However, a majority reading does not always provide the best reading, and the difficulty is more complicated than just the loss of the definite article.

Particularly problematic is the reading φοβος in OG. Montgomery, followed by Collins, suggests the Greek translator read Hebrew root הָרוּת for MT root הָרוּתִּים, giving a hypothetical form הוהי. The verb means to ‘tremble, quake’, but φοβος cannot be counted as its standard equivalent in LXX because it has none in the Greek version.

Clearly the standard Hebrew equivalent of φοβος, הָרוּתִּים, offers no obvious textual solution for הוהי, and though הָרוּתִּים might be considered, it hardly improves on Montgomery’s suggestion, which at least maintains all the consonants of MT, though in a different order.

---


23 HRpSp 252, and lists under the following Greek verbs, yield for הוהי Qal; προσκυνεῖν, Dan 6:26 [27]; συνείσπνεται, Ec 12:3; τρόμειν, Es 5:9 [S2]: for the cognate Aramaic root; τραμέιν Dan 6:26 [27] 5:19: lastly, for Hebrew Piel, ἐπιβουλασθείν in Hab 17. There could be another example of a unique equivalence for φοβεθηθι in Dan 11:31, and of course trembling is associated with fear, being often paralleled with it in the Hebrew Bible (in BA itself הָרוּתִּים and הוהי are used thus in Dan 5:17; 6:27). However, this does not alter the fact that none of the above are standard equivalents. A verb of graphic resemblance to הוהי, which HRp lists as equivalent of φοβεθηθι, is הוהי in Ex 20:18, but here LXX has φοβεθηθεῖνς ὑπὲρ τοῦ κυρίου θεοῦ as equivalent of MT הוהי, צדיק אדני: i.e. where MT has two verbs LXX has one which is the equivalent of צדיק only, or of both verbs as a hendiadys, but not of צדיק alone.
Aramaic provides more than one text-critical solution and the Syriac of the Syro-Hexapla provides the initial clue to the possibility. It exhibits use of the standard Syriac equivalent for φοβος from the root הול, and in Biblical Aramaic the usual counterpart would be אָדָת ה. This could very easily be confused in Aramaic with the particle ן, ( or י ), and a form of root וֹל, ‘be strong’.24 Retroversions to Aramaic could be as follows.

MT > Aram
מֶקֶרֶשׁ רוֹלֶא
מֶקֶרֶשׁ רוֹלֶא ( with Peil participle*)
מֶקֶרֶשׁ רוֹלֶא ( with י and Peil participle*)
מֶקֶרֶשׁ דֶּרוֹלֶא

י. V > Aram
מֶקֶרֶשׁ רוֹלֶא
מֶקֶרֶשׁ רוֹלֶא
מֶקֶרֶשׁ דֶּרוֹלֶא

OQ > Aram
מֶקֶרֶשׁ דֶּרוֹלֶא
מֶקֶרֶשׁ דוֹלֶא
מֶקֶרֶשׁ דֶּרוֹלֶא

The word רוֹל, construct רוֹל, had meanings ‘strength, army’ as well as the adjective ‘strong’. Interestingly, there was also the noun רוֹל, ( לְרֹל ), which meant ‘surrounding’ and was used of the place within the fortification of the Temple.25 There is the term לְלִק or לְלַק which means ‘profane, common’.26 The confusion

24 Zimmermann first noticed the potential for confusion between roots וֹל and וֹל in Aramaic; cf Chapter 2, page 93; but this was based on his interpretation of וֹל in 8:12-13, and not on textual evidence.
25 Ja, Vol 1, 455-6.
26 Ja, Vol 1, 433, where also listed is Hebrew לְלִק, a ‘fortified place, castle’ which is cognate with Aramaic לַק. Aramaic in addition has לְלִק, לְלַק listed p 458-9 with the meaning, ‘hollow, glen, valley’, but these are not relevant to the problem under discussion.
between Yod and Vav being a very common one, it is even possible that an original Aramaic here could have been a word play involving the idea of fortification and profaneness.

The text-critic needs little imagination to see several ways in which some form of corruption led to the variants we have today. The fact that a simple dittography or haplography of Yod or Dalet, in two common Aramaic roots and the ubiquitous particle ת can account for the variation between OG and MT renders an Aramaic solution to this textual problem superior to an hebraic one.

**Reflection on Possible Evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage**

The evidence found in the above two texts suggests that an additional strand must be added to the textual study as it proceeds. Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible usually requires only the retroversion of the Versions into Hebrew; but, in order to give due consideration to the possibility of an Aramaic Vorlage for Daniel 8-12, it is necessary to retrovert both Versions and MT into Aramaic. This will provide additional layers of material to compare with the evidence put forward by Zimmermann and Ginsberg, and with Hebrew text-critical solutions. If the Aramaic texts produced in this process are hypothetical, they should at least conform to the text of a known version as much as a Hebrew text retroverted from a variant.

The broad purpose of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible has historically been determination of the original text from the evidence of MT and the Versions that are available. Such a purpose is not the essential focus of the text-critical work in this study. The above evidence has shifted the aim to that of weighing the textual evidence to see if a problem in a text, whether in MT or a version, is more likely to have derived from an Aramaic Vorlage or a Hebrew text (after excluding inner corruption in a version). Deciding this issue may be possible without coming to a conclusion as to what constitutes the ‘original’ text in any given example.
Indeed, textual study does not even have to assume that there was one original text, but heuristic use of text-critical methods must start somewhere. This starting point is the comparison of different editions and versions of the same text, to ascertain if differences or problems can be explained with reference to one underlying text from which others have deviated. The differences between MT and OG of Daniel are enough to suggest there may have been more than one Semitic edition, but there are also large amounts of text in common which can be compared and investigated for common origins.

Although the two examples described above deal with variants in OG, it seems best, in the interests of objectivity, and for the purposes of comparison, to consider variants in any version which may readily seem to derive from a Hebrew or Aramaic textual error. Clearly, if it is possible to show that there was an Aramaic Vorlage, more precise questions about its relationship to the Hebrew and the Versions arise. These may be more easily discussed when a larger amount of evidence has been evaluated.

The Criteria for Assessment of Textual Solutions

Textual criticism is not an exact science, but for this study it is necessary to have some objective criteria by which to judge whether evidence points to a Hebrew or Aramaic Vorlage. The criteria are broadly as follows.

A) The order of precedence is the common, the less common, uncommon, rare, unique: e.g. a mechanical error comprising a confusion of consonants which is commonly attested, like Vav and Yod, gives a better solution than one that entails uncommonly or rarely confused letters. Common vocabulary is to be preferred above the less common, followed by the rare, the uniquely attested and, lastly, the

---

27 Cf. Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 13, for reflection on more than one authorial text, and A P Hayman, 'The “Original Text”: a Scholarly Illusion' in J Davies, G Harvey & W G E Watson (eds), Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F A Sawyer, (JSOTSup 195, 1995, Sheffield, SAP), 434-449, for the view that ancient Semitic texts were communal phenomena.
hypothetical form of a root. Standard semantic equivalents are better than less common ones, or those employed in unusual contexts.

B) The least number of changes in the text gives the best solution. So e.g. an answer to a problem which entails only pointing, and no consonantal modification is better than one that does: alteration of one consonant / word is better than changes in a plurality, and so on. In this category, translation itself counts as one change in the text, and this means a Hebrew solution to a problem in the Hebrew text always has an advantage over an answer in Aramaic, but this advantage can still be outweighed by other factors which favour Aramaic.

Clearly a hypothesis concerning an Aramaic Vorlage could not be substantiated by appeal to only rare or even unique textual errors or semantic equivalents, though these might be part of a larger body of evidence which comprises common textual errors and semantic matches. Having established theoretically that errors in reading a written text are the only type of evidence that can be used as indication of an Aramaic Vorlage, the assessment of the likelihood of such errors in either the Hebrew or Aramaic can only be made practical with the help of the above criteria. After the gathering of evidence is complete and as much evidence as possible is reviewed, the value of such criteria may itself need to be reconsidered.

Although, as noted at the end of B), Hebrew solutions may seem to always have the edge over Aramaic ones, because the text is available in Hebrew but not in Aramaic, this is not necessarily the case.

1) In Hebrew a complete explanation is in view, whereas an Aramaic solution need only be part of the answer. This is because the Aramaic thesis can include composite solutions which allow for transmission, and therefore textual errors, in Hebrew as well as Aramaic. An Aramaic solution is likely to be more complex than one with Hebrew alone. In many texts the complexity of process in double retroversion, i.e. from a version to Hebrew to Aramaic, may render the ability to decide upon an ‘original’ text almost impossible. The Hebrew solution has the
advantage of a simpler process to be traced and actual Hebrew text for
correction,28 but the Aramaic solution has the advantage that it can encompass
Hebrew textual solutions within it. In summary this means that:

a. Textual problems which can be solved in terms of written transmission in Hebrew
do not disprove the Aramaic translation theory.

b. Those which can be equally solved in terms of Hebrew or Aramaic transmission,
according to the above criteria, are neutral.

c. Textual problems which can only be solved in Aramaic terms are strong evidence
in favour of an Aramaic Vorlage.

II It is because the Hebrew text is available in MT and other Hebrew witnesses,
there is limitation on solutions possible in Hebrew, for the text is restricted to the
words provided by these witnesses. On the other hand, because the Aramaic text is
not available, and has to be retroverted from the Hebrew, there is a flexibility in-built
in any solution where there may be a choice of Aramaic synonyms or homonyms, or
other expressions, to correspond to the Hebrew. However, this flexibility which
favours Aramaic is only relative, for the hypothetical Aramaic must conform in
meaning to an extant Hebrew text or Version, and solutions that employ common
equivalents will always be more convincing than those which do not.

Examination of Ginsberg’s Evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage

It was Ginsberg who first noticed that the verb הָנָשָׁה, when a redundant expression
in MT of Daniel, would be better understood if it was recognised as a Hebrew
translation of the Aramaic verb דַבָּע. This in turn he judged was an error for the

28 A Hebrew solution can of course be made more complex by Aramaism, particularly calque, but it
is evidence of errors in a written Aramaic text which is sought, and for this purpose aramaisms
have to be discounted.
verb עבָר, for he thought that a meaning concerned with geographical movement like ‘pass on / through’ was far more appropriate in these contexts than ‘do’ or ‘act’. In support of this contention, it is notable that in MT of Daniel the verb עבָר occurs twice, in 11:10, 40, on both occasions following the verb שׁלָשׁ, ‘overflow’ or ‘overrun’. In passages which deal in some detail with the movements of monarchs and armies between Egypt and Syria it would not be surprising to find the verb עבָר, in either language, in more frequent use than is apparent in MT of Daniel.

Zimmermann on the other hand had considered these seemingly redundant uses of עבָר as a mistranslation of the Aramaic verb מָלַח, which he maintained could be used in the sense of ‘wage war’, another meaning which in the context of the history of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids would be highly appropriate. This sense is not listed in the semantic range of the verb by either Jastrow or Sokoloff, but Zimmermann was correct in finding this meaning listed by Brockelmann. However, as previously noted, those expressions which Zimmermann defined as ‘mistranslation’ are more accurately understood as calques, in this case semantic borrowings, and these are not proof of an underlying written text.

The verb שעָר occurs twenty-three times in Daniel 8-12, and, of these, it can be judged to make good sense in its context fifteen times: in 8:27; twice in 9:12; in 9:14, 15, 19; 11:6, 23, 36, twice in 11:24 and in the expression שעָר הָרָעַת which occurs in 8:4; 11:3, 16, 36. In examining Ginsberg’s thesis concerning this verb, it seems wise to analyse its use in the remaining eight passages where it is found.

Reference will be made to those occasions when the Peshitta exhibits the precise confusion between עבָר and שעָר which Ginsberg alluded to. Although it can only be assessed as an inner Syriac corruption, it underlines the argument about the suitability of שעָר and not שעָר in certain contexts, and this is emphasised by the

29 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 37: see pages 84-5.
30 Ibid. Brockelmann, 40.
fact that in those fifteen references where ḫuṣy makes good sense in MT, the Peshitta unfailingly renders it by ḥ̄ū.".

| 8:12 | MT          | ḫuṣȳ'ñ̄ ḡ̄n̄īs̄š̄ñ̄         | OG, 967, 0     | και ἐποιήσε καὶ εὐδοκήθη |
|      | Syh         | μὴ καὶ εὐποιήσῃ          | V              | et faciet et prosperabitur |
|      | S           | ḥ̄ū"         |                 |                             |

Ginsberg thought the use of ḫuṣy here might reflect ḫūb̄ in an Aramaic text, but he still retroverted the verb to ḫūb̄̄ and translated ‘and prospered in what he did’.32 Hartman also was content with the sense, ‘and was successful in its undertaking’,33 and this meaning has been accepted by most scholars: even Charles noted that the expression meant that Antiochus, ‘acted with effect’.34 Zimmermann did not list it among the verbs he thought ‘lame and puzzling’.

Montgomery regarded these two verbs as a hendiadys, and Collins’ translation, ‘he acted successfully’ reflects this view.35 The trouble is, the expression seems to be merely a rounding off, in very general terms, of what Antiochus did. It conveys no additional information, since the effectiveness of the actions listed in vv 10-12 are implicit in their being described at all for the reader. Whilst the ideas of ‘doing’ and

---

31 One ms of the Peshitta, 12d2, reads ḥ̄ū"; cf The Peshitta Institute, Daniel-Bel-Draco, 32.
32 Cf page 100; Ginsberg, Studies, 52, 54 and 49, (h) note a. He retroverted into Aramaic imperfect as if reading the perfect with Vav conjunctive as perfect with Vav consecutive, but he translated using a past tense as if reading them as perfect with Vav conjunctive. However this inconsistency makes no difference to the main point that he was not convinced enough that ḫūb̄ lay behind this verb to let it influence his translation into English.
33 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 222.
34 Charles, A Critical, 209.
35 Montgomery, A Critical, 340: Collins, Daniel, 326. The roots occur in this sequence in 2 Chr 31:21 but ḫuṣy is not preceded by a conjunction and meanings in context are clear as ‘he did (with all his heart) and was successful’.
‘succeeding’ are logically matched in this expression, it is questionable why the writer should want to complete this description of extreme measures against the Jewish religion with such a bland summary.

The possibility that Aramaic עבְּרָּ is behind this expression may seem somewhat remote, since to ‘pass on’, with a sense of geographical movement does not particularly seem to connect with the idea of success. However there is geographical movement in v 9 as the horn expands its sphere of influence southwards, eastwards and to Palestine (וֹדֶרֶךְ), and there is otherwise a lack of indication that the forces of the horn left the territory, even though its power was not broken. Thus a verb עבְּרָּ, far from being redundant, could convey some important additional information.

The reading in the Peshitta, an internal error, illustrates how ‘he passed on’ would make sense, and how the mistake could easily have been made in Aramaic. This is the only text which supports the reading ‘it passed on’, but a contextual argument can be made for the superiority of a reading based on the root עבְּרָּ. Richard A Taylor recognises this inner error in the Peshitta and he regarded its reading as ‘easier’ in context.36

---

In this reference the same verbs are found as in 8:12 but in reverse order: there is the same redundancy of expression and the similar reading in the Peshitta meaning ‘he will pass on’. Apart from this, the other major versions support MT and the arguments are therefore the same as for the expression in ch 8:12. The verbs read even more awkwardly in this order than they do in the latter reading, so that the English must read literally ‘he shall prosper and do’ (Montgomery). Some translate one of the verbs adverbially, e.g. ‘he will act successfully’ (Collins), or better, ‘succeed in his undertaking’ (Hartman), thus continuing the idea of a hendiadys, as suggested by Montgomery for the similar expression in 8:12, without referring to that literary device. So the verbs have been translated into English exactly as in 8:12, even though they are in the reverse order.

Ginsberg did not refer to this reading, since his arguments were based on analyses restricted to 8:7-14. Zimmermann, however, listed it among those expressions he traced back to the Aramaic verb הָלָם, because he thought a reference to waging of war was more appropriate than the lame expression הַשָּׁנֵן. This is no clear solution to the problem of the undoubted redundancy of expression, since reference to waging of war would normally precede reference to destroying. The concept of warfare is implicit in the act of destroying and to refer to it between two verbs of הָלָם seems a

---

37 Ibid.
38 Montgomery, A Critical, 349.
39 Collins, Daniel, 327.
40 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 223.
redundancy in itself. All that can be said in favour of this is that at least it is less vague than ‘he will do / act’!

Applying Ginsberg’s theory here might be the most satisfactory answer, but it suffers from the opacity of the references. In the verse as a whole: there is no indication of whom the ‘horn’ destroys in or who are the he destroys later, so it is difficult to develop any sense of the direction of the king’s movements. Taking a broader context, from v 21, there is reference to the king of Greece and then in v 22 to the four kingdoms into which his kingdom is divided: the end of v 24 describes his destroying which, referring to the Jews, indicates an invasion of a foreign power into Palestine. Thus there is, from a wider perspective, some geographical movement implied which might make a verb more appropriate in this place than either or . The logic of this verse seems to develop in the following way: the king grows mighty in power; he succeeds in destroying ‘wonderfully’ (in unspecified regions); he then invades (other unspecified regions but probably, or including, Palestine) and destroys powerful enemies along with the Jews. In this way an argument can be made for the extension of Ginsberg’s theory to this verse.

מִשַּׁשָּׁה and Together

These two examples of in 8:12, 24, are connected with the verb , and it is possible that an understanding of the meaning of would be elucidated by an exploration of the sense of . The root, which occurs in both Hebrew and Aramaic, according to the lexicons has the primary sense to ‘split, force an entry, invade, advance’ and the secondary meaning to ‘succeed, prosper’. There is in fact a question as to whether there are two different roots involved in this word, but the Hebrew Qal is, on the basis of its use in Judges (with ) and in 1 Sam 19:18
(where it is problematic) sometimes given the meaning to ‘rush’. KB3 lists the semantic range of the Hebrew root as:

Qal cut through, cross, rush to / towards, storm in, force entry into; in Amos 5:6, break in or set ablaze: succeed, be successful:
Hiphil be successful: make successful.

Jastrow lists the Aramaic range of meaning for this root as:

Peal split, pass through: be successful, become fit, prosper:
Pael split:
Aphel pass through: be successful, prosper: cause to succeed or prosper.

It is notable that any of the meanings ‘rush, invade, advance, pass through’ for the root נָעַשְׁאָלָה would make excellent sense in the contexts of 8:12, 24, when coupled with the meaning ‘pass over’ for the root דְּשָׁא. Possible translations would be:

8:12 נָעַשְׁאָלָה הַנְּעָשְׁאָלָה ‘it will pass over and rush on / invade / advance pass through’

8:24 נָעַשְׁאָלָה הַנְּעָשְׁאָלָה ‘he will rush on / invade / advance / pass through and pass over’

However MT uses the Hiphil of נָעַשְׁאָלָה and this Hebrew causative stem seems to carry only the derivative meaning ‘succeed’ along with the transitive idea to ‘cause to succeed, to prosper’.

If Aramaic was the original language behind the MT verbs, there are two possible explanations which would account for the Hiphil stem in a Hebrew translation. Aramaic originals could have been, with נָעַשְׁאָלָה in the Peal:

---

41 KB3, Vol 3, 1025-6
or, with נָתַל in the Apel,

8:12 נָתַל וַיִּכְבֶּר 8:24 נָתַל וַיִּכְבֶּר

a) The use of either stem for נָתַל in Aramaic would produce the same consonantal text, but each would carry a similar range of meanings and would pose a problem for a translator in the context of ch 8. With an original Aramaic use of the verb עָבַר the sense of נָתַל would more likely be in the range ‘rush on, invade advance, pass through’. If the common error of misreading Resh as Dalet, עָבַר as the verb עָבַר, occurred, the sense of נָתַל would probably have been mistaken as ‘succeed / prosper’ and it could have resulted in the use of Hebrew Hiphil נָתַלְתָם.

b) Another possibility is that original Aramaic verbs were read as Apel stems of נָתַל, as above, meaning ‘rush on, invade, advance, pass through’, and were translated into Hiphil verbs as calques of the Apel stem, the translator assuming that the Apel and Hiphil of נָתַל had the same semantic range.

The fact that it is possible to find a better meaning than ‘succeed’ for the verb נָתַל in 8:12, 24 by recourse to Aramaic is support for Ginsberg’s thesis that עָבַר in MT reflects use of נָתַל in Aramaic. In favour of Ginsberg’s interpretation of עָבַר in general, it can argued that in sections dealing with the wars between Egypt and Syria, as they affected Jerusalem in particular, the verb עָבַר would be a natural feature, as it is in e.g. 2 Samuel 18-19.

If the root נָתַל as used in 8:12, 24 was meant to convey either the idea of invasion or of passing through, then its use with the root עָבַר (i.e. with עָבַר in Aramaic) would parallel that of נָתַל with עָבַר in 11:10, 40.
There is of course no textual variant which witnesses to these readings based on a hypothetical original, but neither is there evidence that any of the ancient versions understood the MT terms to be hendiadys. Each of them gives a literal rendering of MT: not even Jerome attempts to supply an idiomatic rendering equivalent to the English ‘succeed in action’. Unless it can be shown that the hendiadys would be recognised in Greek, Syriac and Latin as well as Hebrew, we must assume that the ancients understood the literal sense of MT as they read it.

Finally there is the problem of the reversal of the order of the verbs between v 12 and v 24. It was noted that as MT stands רתי ועשה makes some sense but this is hardly the case with the verbs in reverse order in v 24. הדלקת ועשה, though commentators tend to treat both sets of verbs as the same hendiadys without explaining the change in order. In v 24 it is the idea of success preceding action that is the problem, and MT only reads well if the second verb, רעשה, is conjoined to the verb that follows it, rather than to הדלקת. Thus the verse could run ‘he shall destroy wonderfully and succeed ( in this ), he will take action and destroy strong ones and a people of holy things’; this in fact is the division followed by the Peshitta, but it is not the phrasing in the Hebrew of MT.

Would the alternative readings, suggested by positing underlying Aramaic, be easier to reconcile with the reversal of verbs in the MT? In v 24 the phrasing might be: ‘he will destroy wonderfully: he will invade / advance / rush on / pass through and pass over / on and he will destroy strong ones and a people of holy things’. There is no problem in making sense of the military manoeuvres in this verse: in fact there are a number of combinations that would be acceptable.

In v 12 the alternative reading might be: ‘he will pass over and will advance / rush on / pass through’. Thus the meanings gleaned from retroverting the MT verbs to Aramaic roots רבר and דלק posit no real problem when reversed in order. Although there is no textual evidence of an alternative reading ‘pass over’ for MT נשן in 8:12, 24, except for inner error in the Peshitta, the contextual argument for
Ginsberg’s view that Aramaic הערב lies behind MT הער in these verses is persuasive. It is supported by the meanings ‘pass through, rush on, advance’ which can be attributed to the MT verb הערל הערל when an underlying Aramaic verb הערל is assumed. Its basis is the assumption of a common confusion between Resh and Dalet, and it would have been an early error in the text since it has affected the meaning of all the Versions including OG.

Ginsberg retroverted this phrase to ספכ, and he translated it, ‘and he shall do his pleasure in them’, but he cross-referenced it to 11:39 where he preferred the verb נבר. So if he entertained the possibility that Aramaic ספכ and נבר lay behind the verb, he was not convinced enough to adopt its sense for the English meaning.

Zimmermann listed this phrase amongst those instances where Aramaic נבר, which carried the meaning ‘wage war, do battle’ as well as ‘work, do’ in Eastern Aramaic, was mistranslated through choice of the wrong meaning for the context.

The Versions support MT הער, except for the Peshitta which again has the same inner error as in 8:12, 24. Montgomery resorted to hendiadys with the verb following, so that ספכ he translated ‘he shall deal with them and

---

42 Taylor, The Peshitta, 263, does not list this instance of inner Syriac error, but he comments on the same in vv 17, 39; cf 264, 284.
shall prevail'. His interpretation is still evident in those of Hartman and Collins.\textsuperscript{43} though Hartman added that the use of קִזְזָזָה to mean 'prevail' was itself an Aramaism.

With this variety of views, the sequence of meaning in the second part of the verse, depending on how the phrase is translated, could be any of the following:

1) With the Aramaic root לֹאְנָה underlying הָעַשֵׁה; 'he will bring his army and will come against ( enter into ) the stronghold of the king of the north and will cross over against them and he will prevail':

2) With the Aramaic root לֹאְנָה underlying הָעַשֵׁה; 'he will bring his army and will come against the stronghold of the king of the north and will wage war against them and he will prevail':

3) With a hendiadys in Hebrew; 'he will bring his army and will come against the stronghold of the king of the north and will deal with them and will prevail'.

The second alternative gives the smoothest sequence of events since, in the first alternative, the crossing over would be expected to precede the reaching of the stronghold. In the third alternative, the idea of prevailing is already implicit in 'deal with them', though it could be argued that קִזְזָזָה was added for emphasis. Even if Zimmermann's theory is correct, he has only demonstrated the possibility that הָעַשֵׁה is a calque of an Eastern Aramaic use of the verb לֹאְנָה and, as has already been stated, a calque is no proof that a written Aramaic text lies behind the Hebrew.

Another problem with this phrase is the antecedent of the suffix on ב. It is generally assumed that the Syrians are referred to, although there is no masculine plural antecedent to appeal to. The difficulty is compounded by the seemingly unexpected reading in OG, ταραχην. The Greek word has the semantic range, 'trouble,

\textsuperscript{43} Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 257; Collins, Daniel, 364.
disorder, disturbance, upheaval, commotion, tumult, political confusion'. Montgomery\textsuperscript{44} thought that the Greek translator had read נדנדה, referring to Isa 22:5 where the Hebrew word means ‘dismay, consternation, panic’, from root נד. This word is frequently associated in MT with warfare and describes the state to which defeated forces can be reduced,\textsuperscript{45} so it would be suitable in this context.

Collins suggests that the pronoun may have been the long form בֶּהָנְס as it would more easily have been confused with נדנדה without mater lexionis, since the confusion of Bet and Mem is a common one. A weakness in this argument is that this long form is not apparent elsewhere in Hebrew Daniel, though a particular manuscript which employed it could have given rise to the error.

An Aramaic solution to this problem might be found in the noun אנהף, which means ‘confusion’, and which in absolute form, ובנה, might easily be confused with the pronoun נדַּב since Tav, and Vav in ligature with final Nun could be confused in some scripts.\textsuperscript{46} The Aramaic noun comes from בֶּל, to ‘be stirred up, confounded, in disorder’, and it would suit the context equally as well as the Hebrew נדנדה without the need to assume a lengthened pronoun.

However, since Hebrew נדנדה is well documented in MT, and mechanical confusion of Bet and Mem is common, the Hebrew solution has the advantage here, though it is notable that there is an Aramaic possibility as well. Either word would require the sense ‘make / cause’ for the verb מָלַל נון. Therefore Ginsberg’s theory has not been supported in this text, and it cannot be used as definite evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage.

\textsuperscript{44} Montgomery, \textit{A Critical}, 432; Jeansonne, \textit{The Old Greek}, 123; Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 364; they all adopt this explanation.

\textsuperscript{45} Cf Deut 7:23; 28:20; 1 Sam 5:9, 11; 14:20; Isa 22:5; Ezek 7:7; 22:5; Prov 15:16; Am 3:9;

\textsuperscript{2} 2 Chr 15:5. See also 1 Q Hod 3:25.

\textsuperscript{46} Cf pages 135-6.
11:17 MT רֵיֵשׁ אֲחָלֵי לֹאֵל חַגִּיקֶה לְפָלָם חָוָה יִשְׁרֵיָם חֲמוֹרָה רַעְשָׁה
4QDan⁶ וְריֵשׁ אֲחַלֶּה לֹאֵל חַגִּיקֶה לְפָלָם חָוָה יִשְׁרֵיָם חֲמוֹרָה רַעְשָׁה
kV et ponet faciem suam ut veniat ad tenendum universum⁴⁷ regnum eius et recta faciet cum eo
OG & kai δοσεῖ το προσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐπελθεῖν βιά παν το ἔργον
967 αὐτοῦ καὶ συνθηκας μετα' αὐτον ποιησεται
Syh καὶ τὰς προσωπίς αὐτοῦ ἐπέστην ἐπὶ ἄρτι πάντα μετα' αὐτον ποιησει.
Θ καὶ ταξεὶ το προσωπον αὐτοῦ εἴσελθειν ἐν ἰσχυι πάσης τῆς βασιλειας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐθέλεια παντα μετα' αὐτον ποιησει.
S καὶ τὰς προσωπίς αὐτοῦ εἴσελθειν ἐν ἰσχυι πάσης τῆς βασιλειας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐθέλεια παντα μετα' αὐτον ποιησει.

A simple reading of this verse suggests it is a good example of a context where  רַעְשָׁה would read far better than רֹאשׁ, for it makes a more sensible sequel to the verb קַרְבָּל. Ginsberg did not allude to this text, but Zimmermann listed it among the references where he preferred Aramaic רָקֶל as the key to the intended meaning of the author. He translated, ‘And he will set his face to come with all the forces of his kingdom, with his officers and attack’, reading קַרְבָּל, ‘army’, for תַּחַל, and רֹאשׁ, ‘officers’, for בָּשָׂר וֹשֵׂה.⁴⁸

OG ποιησεται suggests a Hebrew reading רֹאשׁ and this is supported by all the other Versions, and possibly 4QDan⁶ which has an ambiguous reading.⁴⁹ The imperfect preformative instead of the conjunction changes the sense of the clause, and, with D'Ht'rl read as either בָּשָׂר וֹשֵׂה ( as in v 6 ), or as בָּשָׂר שְׂכָרֵים to give

⁴⁷ Montgomery, A Critical, 442 considered Jerome had taken יִשְׁרֵיָם in the sense of יִשְׁרֵיָם, ‘circle’, in his translation universum, but this is just his equivalent of יִשְׁרֵיָם: see MT and Vulgate in 11:37-38; cf page 170.
⁴⁸ Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 37.
⁴⁹ Cf Ulrich, ‘Daniel’ Pt 2, 22-3. According to Kennicott, Hebrew ms 449 also reads רֹאשׁ.
\[\text{συνθηκας, provides a clause which makes good sense with what follows: ‘...and he will make a treaty with him and will give him the daughter ...’} \]

There are a number of other problems associated with this verse: OG reads \(\text{εργον α\varepsilon\tauον for μελαχτή, which Ulrich suggests results from reading μελαχτή, but support from 4QDan⁶ is unclear, since it has a defective reading.}\]

This solution is better than an Aramaic one employing the standard equivalent for μελαχτή, עבידות, which bears little resemblance to μελαχτή.

There is also difficulty in tracing with certainty all the antecedents of the pronominal suffixes: whilst the antecedent of the suffix in \(\text{ול תוי is certainly the king of the south,⁵¹} \) it is not clear to whom the kingdom belongs. Some take μελαχτή to refer to the king of the north, who comes with all his power to the south, and others take it to refer to the king of the south, whose kingdom the king of the north enters.⁵²

The Peshitta has a markedly different reading from MT and OG, from ‘kingdom’ to the end of the verse. Firstly it has the plural \(\text{אָלמָּה לָמָּה} \) which also lacks a pronoun suffix to match the Hebrew: then it has a second occurrence of \(\text{אָל} \) which has no counterpart in the Hebrew, and this appears to replace MT \(\text{שֶׁרֶשֶׁר}. \) With the latter omission, \(\text{אָל} \) appears to modify the following \(\text{אָלמָּה} \) which must then be read as a noun with suffix, ‘his people’. Taylor considers the Peshitta translator was uncertain how to understand the Hebrew word, but he draws attention to the \(\text{θ} \) reading \(\text{εὐθεία παντά} \) which also supports a second \(\text{לכ in the Hebrew Vorlage.}⁵³ \) The Peshitta agrees with all the other Versions in that it has no conjunction before its equivalent

---

⁵⁰ Ibid.
⁵¹ Cf Collins, Daniel, 381 for a summary of the historical references.
⁵² See e.g. Bevan, A Short Commentary, 183, and Montgomery, A Critical, 441 for conflicting views.
⁵³ Taylor, The Peshitta, 264, 284. M P Weitzman, The Syriac Version of the Peshitta: An Introduction (1999, Cambridge, CUP), 33-6 noted that the Peshitta translator often tried to improve the text: though Weitzman did not deal with this verse in Daniel, he furnished examples in Ps 1:1; Isa 44:16-17; Gen 39:33 et al; but in this instance it is difficult to argue that the Syriac reading is superior to MT.
of וישה but it renders the latter with לוכה. In the next clause, as Taylor observes, with a passive verb for MT active יר합, ירה becomes the subject instead of the king, so that the sense of the Peshitta preceding this is, `...and he will set his face to enter all kingdoms and all his people will cross over (and the daughter...)` This is an unclear reading in the context, and the Greek texts are to be preferred. If the Syriac translator did have access to one of the Greek texts, their reading of ישים was not followed, and it is more likely that there was some corruption in the Vorlage.

The following retroversions may be compared to the Hebrew witnesses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>4QDan5</th>
<th>OG &gt; Heb</th>
<th>θ &gt; Heb</th>
<th>S &gt; Heb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ירשים פניך שבтелך כל מלכותיו וישרימי עם תעשה</td>
<td>ירשים את בני שבтели כל מך ירשיםי עם תעשה</td>
<td>ירשים פניך שבтели כל מלכותיו וישרימי עם תעשה</td>
<td>ירשים פניך שבтели כל מלכותיו וישרימי עם תעשה</td>
<td>ירשים פניך שבтели כל מלכותיו וכל עם תיבור</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no clear explanation for the text of the Peshitta in this verse. The plural מלחמה is most easily understood as an internal Syriac reading, since the consonantal forms of the plural and singular emphatic are the same, though it is hardly a difficulty to postulate the loss of Yod before Vav in the Hebrew plural מלחמה. Loss of the third masculine pronominal suffix, however, is most easily explained in a Hebrew text with ירשיםון, for MT has a run of two Vavs and a Yod in the juxtaposition of מלכותיו וישרימי and the first Vav could easily have been omitted. Even if the Vorlage of the Peshitta lacked ירשיםון, simple metathesis with Vav read as Yod may have transformed the singular noun with suffix, מלכותו וישרימי, to a plural without it, מלכותו וישרימי. 4QDan5 and OG, if Ulrich’s retroversion is correct, witness to the type of corruption that can occur, and so perhaps in the Hebrew

---

54 Taylor, ibid., notes the inner error in the latter. For his comments on the other differences between MT and the Peshitta in this verse, cf his pp 264, 282, 284, 286.
manuscript of the Syriac translator יִשְרֵי מ was lost or illegible. The repetition of equivalents to כל in Theodotion and the Peshitta are suggestive of a dittography of the same in a Hebrew text.

| MT > Aram | ורש אפודיו למועלה בחקה כל מלכותה ובשרי עמו ומעבד |
| OG > Aram | ורש אפודיו למועלה בחקה כל עביייתה וביהו מעבד |
| θ > Aram | ורש אפודיו למועלה בחקה כל מלכותה וכל נשרי עמו מעבד |
| S > Aram | ורש אפודיו למועלה בחקה כל מלכותא וכל נשא עמה מעבה |

It has already been noted that a solution to OG το ἐργον is not probable in Aramaic. Neither do the forms יִשְרֵי מ and חָשִׁירִים, though they have three elements in common, offer a better mechanical solution than מְשָרִים and יִשְרֵי מ, which are identical except for Mem.

There is a slightly greater probability in Aramaic than in Hebrew that כל was copied twice, because of the Kaph in חָשִׁירִים, but this is not enough to overcome the disadvantages in an Aramaic solution overall. The difference between the plural and singular is easier in Aramaic, but since it is the plural of the Syriac حَلَقة which is in question, and this need only be due to seyam wrongly added, it is no great advantage for an early Aramaic solution. If in the orthography of the emphatic state final He was employed, this could have been confused with the third masculine suffix, and it would explain the lack of it in the Peshitta reading without any consonant change. Yet even this, which in other contexts might be a large plus for an Aramaic Vorlage behind the Hebrew, does not seem enough to overcome the obvious problems with an overarching Aramaic solution to the textual problems.

Although the Peshitta again illustrates Ginsberg’s thesis, with its internal error of הָא, he was correct not to apply his idea to this verse. The textual problems are probably due to corruption in Hebrew transmission, and in context the sense that the
king would make peace or a treaty by means of an expedient marriage of the princess is better than that provided by the Peshitta.

Ginsberg referred to this verse as one in which ḥâšû wa assurredly represents an original Aramaic י”ח and, as MT stands, it clearly gives a superior sense to read ‘he will pass through and return to his own land’, rather than ‘he will take action and return to his own land’. There is a clear sense of geographical movement and since the king is twice recorded as returning to his own land, there must be a point in between where he emerges out of it, in order to return again.

Zimmermann translated ‘and he shall do battle and return to his country’, on the basis of an erroneous translation of root ה”ח: this meaning, or ‘he shall wage war’, would also be preferable to MT. It might even be considered superior to Ginsberg’s suggestion, because the meaning yielded is more precise than his. All the Versions support MT’s use of root ḥâšû, but it is ironic that at this point the Peshitta does not exhibit its tendency to make the very textual misreading that illustrates Ginsberg’s point, as it has in the previous four readings. Its brief reading joins the sense of the verb in question to a foreshortened v 29 thus:
All the other primary versions support MT against this short reading and it is perhaps unlikely in this case that lectio brevior praeferenda est.

OG joins לֹאֵם of v 29 to v 28. In MT there are four conjunctions in v 28 and three in v 29, but there is none, either before לֹאֵם or the verb והשלך which follows, to indicate where a new clause begins. It is possible that a Vav has been lost after the suffix of והשלך or, less likely, before the Yod of והשלך, but the sense does not require this assumption. The Peshitta also has a shorter v 30 which affects the discussion of the next section and a decision concerning v 28 cannot be taken without examination of vv 29-30.56

11:30 MT

 vb כְּדֵי מַעֲשֵׂה יְהֵשׁ בַּעֲשָׂר

θ καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ θυμωθήσεται ἐπί διαθήκην ἁγιαν καὶ ποιησει καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ συνησει.

OG καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ ὁργισθήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ ἁγιοῦ καὶ ποιησει καὶ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ διανοησθήσεται.

Syh וְיִנָּת בְּמַעֲשָׂר בִּקְרִית קֹדֶשׁ בַּעֲשָׂר

V et indignabitur contra testamentum sanctuarii et faciet reverteturque et cogitabit

S וָכְבָּד בָּדָא חָרָם וְלָא הָשָּׁם

Ginsberg was confident that דָּשָׁנ in this verse was an error for יִנָּת in Aramaic.57

Zimmermann, on the other hand, did not include it in his list of verbs mistranslated

55 Ginsberg, Studies, 49, (h), note a.
56 Taylor, The Peshitta, 266, 278 records these omissions in the Peshitta and attributes them to the intention of the translator to simplify the repetitious Hebrew account. He implies the translator overstepped his limits because the sense was changed.
57 Ginsberg; cf note 55 above.
from מַלֵּךְ, which is surprising because a similar sequence of verbs is found to the one in v 28.

Just as in v 28, most of the Versions, including OG, support MT, but this time the Peshitta omits the verbs altogether in another shortened verse. In MT verses 28-30 are repetitious, the root בָּשֵׂב occurring five times and the word בָּרִית three times: the verbs הַעֲשָׂרָה בָּשֵׂב occur in that sequence in both v 28 and v 30, and the Peshitta may be based on a manuscript with haplographic omissions, or there may have been some glossing, or even rewriting of the original to make the historical sequence clearer.58

At this point it is sufficient to say that Ginsberg’s thesis is certainly possible, and even attractive, but there is no textual evidence in the Versions to support his idea. In his favour, however, there is MT itself in 11: 10, where we find the sequence of verbs בָּשֵׂב בֹּאָה רָשַׁתָּה עֶבֶר יוֹשְׁבָה, and in 11:40-41a, where the series occurs, רָשַׁתָּה בֹּאָה ... בֹּאָה עֶבֶר בֹּאָה. The verbs in 11:10, 40 could be indicators of what was originally in vv 28, 30 ( in Aramaic ), since they show how closely the verb עֶבֶר was associated with בֹּאָה and בָּשֵׂב. That is, Ginsberg’s idea that הַעֲשָׂרָה in these three verses indicates Aramaic original רוֹעֶר is in keeping with the style of vv 10 and 40.

58 Taylor; cf note 56 above. Weitzman, The Syriac, 18 and note 10, suggests parablepsis caused the short reading in the Peshitta of 11:28-9, in contrast to Taylor who finds deliberate simplification on the part of the Syriac translator.
Of the eight passages under consideration, this is the least likely to support Ginsberg’s thesis, and he himself did not employ this verse to do so. Zimmermann, on the other hand, used it to support his view of the origin of ἐπιστρέφειν: he translated ‘and a people, conscious of their God, will take courage and fight back’.

Clearly the idea of ‘waging war’ or ‘fighting back’ is much more attractive than simply ‘take action’, being more specific and also describing precisely the actions of the Maccabees, whose methods are otherwise and surprisingly not mentioned. On the other hand, πρᾶξει occurs in the preceding prayer, in 9:19, meaning, ‘take action!’ The reader may be supposed to understand that divine action will take place through those who know him, and this is the answer to the prayer in ch 9.

The Greek and Latin support the MT verb. OG, followed by Syro-Hexapla, has ταύτα where MT reads ἄλλως, but this does not affect the analysis of ἐπιστρέφειν. The Peshitta has a shorter reading yet again, with no equivalent for ἐπιστρέφειν and, in addition, to its own peculiar variant meaning ‘fear’ for MT’s ‘his God’.  

59 Taylor, The Peshitta, 266, 283, where the term is understood to mean a pagan deity.
Retroversions of MT, OG and the Peshitta would suggest the textual variation arose in Hebrew:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MT} & \quad \text{תנמו דועי אלדחי חוקו ועשור} \\
\text{OG} \Rightarrow \text{Heb} & \quad \text{תנמו דועי אלדחי חוקו ועשור} \\
\text{S} \Rightarrow \text{Heb,} & \quad \text{תנמו דועי יראת חוקו}
\end{align*}
\]

The OG reading תאורה can be explained in terms of a confusion between the Hebrew terms אל and חיל where the letters Yod and Vav of the pronominal suffix in MT have fallen out before Yod and Het of the verb following. The second Yod of דועי has also fallen out because of Ayin. The Syriac סלמה is difficult. It may be a stock euphemism: an inner Syriac error is unlikely because Het and He are dissimilar graphically, thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S} & \quad \text{סמה סנה לסה סלמה סלמה} \\
\text{MT} \Rightarrow \text{Syr} & \quad \text{סמה סנה לסה סלמה סלמה}
\end{align*}
\]

Strangely, a confusion between ‘fear’ and ‘their God’ would have been possible, though not straightforward, in Aramaic if an emphatic participle was employed, thus

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MT} \Rightarrow \text{Aram} & \quad \text{עמיא דירעיא די אלדחי חוקפין ויעבדרן} \\
\text{S} \Rightarrow \text{Aram} & \quad \text{עמיא דירעיא די רוהיא חוקפין}
\end{align*}
\]

Apart from the last verb, the equivalent of the Syriac, allowing for metathesis, differs only in having Het for He, and Dalet and Yod also for He. The form תוריהל might have been produced similarly by metathesis after a haplography of Aleph. The OG in this manner would retrovert to:

\[\text{Weitzman, The Syriac, 52-3 does not include elements from ‘fear’ as a euphemism for the divine name in the Peshitta, which uses א for the Tetragrammaton. Cf Taylor; ibid.}\]
Another mode of retroversion could employ the accusative instead of the genitive:

MT > Aram,

OG > Aram

S > Aram

These show no greater likelihood of a solution than the previous Aramaic texts.

The clearest answer found in this section is that MT and OG can be traced to a Hebrew error. All other problems are more complicated and yield no indisputable evidence of an Aramaic Vorlage.
The following text is an example where Ginsberg believed Aramaic נער lay behind Hebrew מועון.

MT ( ... ) [38] יְהֵהֵן מְגַלּוֹן ( על כּנ) הַאֲלֹהַיָּהָ מְנוּדִי

θ ὅτι ἐπὶ παντάς μεγαλύνθησαν [38] καὶ θεον µαωζίν

V quia adversum universa consurget [38] deum autem Maozim

α (233) κραταιωματων

LXX Hi [et] deum fortissimum ebr' [et] deum maozim

S ἡβεξ εὐτάθεν (38) ἔστιν ἐπὶ δεῖ ὑπερ

α (pr.) [et] deum fortitudinum

OG [37] ὅτι ἐν παντὶ ὑψωθησαν, καὶ ὑποταγησαν αὐτῷ ἐθνή ἰσχυρα. ( [38] ἐπὶ τον τοπον... )

967ΒΙ ἐν [παντὶ] υψωθησαν [καὶ θεὸν] ὑποταγησαν επὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑποταγησαν αὐτῷ [ἐθνὴ] ἰσχυρὰ

Syh ὡδεις ἡβεξ εὐτάθεν αὐτῷ (38) ἔστιν ἐπὶ δεῖ ὑπερ

The expression ‘the god of strongholds’ has puzzled commentators for many years and various divine entities have been suggested for the allusion. Ginsberg retroverted דִּינְא to הם, ‘saints’, which he assumed had been misread as ‘strongholds’; but there is no textual evidence for this reading and there is no sure way of supporting the interpretation ‘saints’ in this context. However, there are variants in OG, supported by the Syro-Hexapla, and P967, which are worth examining in the light of the previous study of 11:31. The other versions were clearly reading MT or something much nearer it than OG, but transliterations in Theodotion and Jerome show that דִּינְא caused problems for translators in this context.

---

62 The restoration of 967 is Roga-Puig’s; cf ‘Daniele’, 9-10, 16.
63 Ginsberg, Studies, 46, 49 (g) and (h) note a: pages 102-3, 106.
64 Cf pages 143-5.
Although Di Leila thought the transliterations in Theodotion which have Aramaic plural endings were evidence of translation from Aramaic, he did not list Ῥωκττν among his examples. It is difficult to explain this ending in a transliteration into Greek if it does not reflect a transcribing into Greek characters of what was actually written in the Semitic manuscript, but it is not proof of an Aramaic Vorlage. MT contains an Aramaic ending in 12:13. If the Jewish copyists’ first or vulgar language was Aramaic, the occasional error of writing an Aramaic plural ending instead of a Hebrew is understandable, especially with a masculine plural where it is only a difference of Nun for Mem.

Montgomery considered OG inexplicable. Collins translated it ‘strong nations will be subjected to him’. the Greek verb being singular with a neuter plural subject. In fact this part of OG makes sense, but after it ἐπὶ τοῦ τοποῦ αὐτοῦ provides a non-sequitur, and κινησει is difficult to account for.

Retroversions could be as follows:

continued...

---

65 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 14-15, note 17; cf page 118.
66 There are other examples of Aramaic masculine plural endings in MT Hebrew, not to mention their common use in MH: see GKC 87 e; M H Segal, Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew (1927, Oxford, Clarendon), #281. In Dan 4:14; Ezra 4:13; 1QapGen 21; 20; 21; 10.13, the reverse is found, Hebrew masculine plural suffixes in Aramaic text: see Ros 24 #42; S E Fassberg, ‘Hebraisms in the Aramaic Documents’, SQ4, 55-6.
68 Collins, Daniel, 368, note 130.
69 Thackeray, A Grammar, 23.
70 Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 207 indicates this hiatus in the Greek text.
71 Montgomery, A Critical, 464, suggests an inner Greek error for τιμησει: in uncial this would be ΚΙΝΗΣΕΙ for ΤΙΜΗΣΕΙ.
Hebrew Solution for MT, OG-Syh

A Semitic equivalent of OG אשת could have arisen (or been lost) from a couplet in Hebrew, since in עמי ועמו there are four common consonants. Zayin, the only unique element, could have been formed by reduplication of a lengthened Yod, or been lost by haplography, and Ayin and Mem subject to metathesis.

The word שרה, equivalent of אשת, could derive from גם with He read as Yod and Vav, a reverse ligature. Although He of وسلم could have been formed from a ligature of Yod and Vav, this seems less likely because גם is needed in the clause to make sense with על בני בכבד, there being nothing in the Greek texts to supply a better meaning. That was in the OG Vorlage and so it must be assumed that at some point وسلم was lost from the latter. If this really was corrupted to وسلم, then Vav and Lamed must also have fallen out from وسلم before the Lamed at the end.

---

72 An alternative explanation for وسلم would be a couplet of של, i.e. the phonetically similar של and של if such an alternative form of the third masculine singular pronoun suffix was ever used with the preposition, but as a whole this is rather far-fetched scenario.
of רדסה. However, this would not have been possible in the manuscript of OG because there רדסה, or a verb of similar meaning, intervened between the two words with Lamed. In other words, if this explanation for the loss of לְלָכֵל holds true, then OG קאַי יִפְטַאָגְסֶנֶטַי must either be secondary in some way or it was lost from the Hebrew text before the above corruption took place. However, this in fact makes the corruption unlikely because there would have been no verb to which יִלָּל could sensibly relate.

The conjunction with the imperfect, ויתררה, was chosen for קאַי יִפְטַאָגְסֶנֶטַי rather than the perfect with Vav consecutive, after the style of 11:36. Confusion of ויתררה with ויתררב could have occurred if final Lamed in the latter had lost its upper stroke to leave the lower one resembling Vav. It is less likely that Vav would have acquired an upper stroke and have come to look like a Lamed. In which case if ויתררב developed as ditography of ויתררב, Gimel would have been read as Resh and Yod reduplicated to produce the conjunction.

All this accounts for the OG reading קאַי יִפְטַאָגְסֶנֶטַי אוּרוֹ ָ sophisticated 'סוחר as an erroneous ditography of MT, or a conflation of different readings:

יִתְנֵבָל לְלָכֵל
יִתְנֵבָל יַחַרְרַר
אלֵי עָכִים מְעָכִים

The difficulty here is with the loss of two Lameds, which could only have happened in two stages: firstly Vav and Lamed falling out before Dalet Lamed; then Lamed read as Vav as part of the corrupt verb ויתררה. On the whole this is rather a complicated corruption of the Hebrew text, though not impossible.  

73 The right stroke of Gimel would have been skewed to the upright and the left stroke shortened in order to appear as Resh; cf Cross, ‘The Development, 137, lines 1, 5-6 where the right strokes of Gimel are nearly vertical.

74 A variation might be a sequence of verbs similar to those in 11:36, יִתְרֹמְס וּיִתְנֵבָל לְלָכֵל.
Here, after corruption of יִתְנֵבָל וּיִתְרֹמְס would have been both transposed after וּיִתְנֵבָל and
Aramaic Solution for MT, OG-Syh

The Aramaic preposition with suffix, הָלַע, which may have been confused with the last two consonants of הָלַע הָלַע could account for OG אַבּוּרְפ. An Aleph at the end of an Aramaic singular verb, such as נָתַח, a possible equivalent of Greek ὑποταγήσεται, could have caused haplography of the first consonant of the noun בְּרָאשִׁים. Yet, since the Greek verb is singular because the subject is neuter plural, it should have accurately translated a plural Semitic verb. So if Aramaic הָלַע replaced הָלַע, there is no clear way to graphically account for the loss of Aleph which this change would entail. The situation is not improved with employment of פְּלַק for בָּשַׁנְה, for although this Aramaic word provides an Aleph, which, through metathesis, might help to produce הָלַע, there is still the loss of מֵנָא.. to explain and the extra Lamed in הָלַע.

In fact there seems little potential in Aramaic for an answer to the problem, and this is the case if synonyms, either תֵּקֵיפָה or רָקְבָּן, are employed instead of הָלַע.

P967 has a longer text than OG-Syh and a critical examination of its reading may be worth while for this investigation.75

---

75 In all this section it must be remembered that the reading of P 967 is Roga-Puig’s restoration, which seems safe enough. An alternative might be a simple dittography in 967 of the verb ὑποταγήσεται, which would fit instead of [θ][θ][θ]οθήσεται if there was a gap instead of Theta; but this does not take account of the whole space available in the manuscript and the following έπ αὐτον. Cf Roga-Puig, ‘Daniele’, 16.
Greek Solution for MT, OG-Syh, P967

There seems to be potential in the Greek of Papyrus 967 for homoioteleuton because of three verbs with a similar ending...οὐθήσεται.

967

υψωθησεται [καὶ θυμωθησεται ἐπ αὐτ[ους καὶ υποταγ]ησεται αυτω

OG-Syh

υψωθησεται καὶ υποταγησεται αυτω

In uncial:

967

ΥΨΩΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΘΥΜΩΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΕΠ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΥΠΟΤΑΓΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΩ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΝ ΤΟΠΟΝ

OG-Syh

ΥΨΩΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΥΠΟΤΑΓΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΩ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΝ ΤΟΠΟΝ

In fact parablepsis based on the verbal endings does not explain the loss of the pronoun αὐτοὺς, and only parablepsis based on καὶ accounts for the loss of καὶ θυμωθησεται ἐπ αὐτοὺς. This is one possible way the Greek texts came to differ; but since MT is the shortest text, the difference between it and the Greek texts cannot be explained in terms of haplography in Greek. The text of OG-Syh was tentatively explained above in terms of dittography in Hebrew, but could the longer Greek texts also be accounted for by dittography in Greek?

Dittography in a Greek text equivalent to MT, or conflation of Greek alternatives might explain why OG grew longer than MT, especially 967, but it would entail accretion of two extra verbs plus an extra preposition with pronoun as follows.
There is no clear reason in Greek why these alternatives should have developed, and they are more likely to reflect differences in Semitic texts.

Hebrew Solution

11:37b-38a

MT

{יִפְרְטֹל מָנָעֶה} אֲלָלָה מִיִּשְׁמָע עַל כֹּנַּה

OG > Heb

{יִפְרְטֹל מָנָעֶה אֲלָלָה מִיִּשְׁמָע עַל כֹּנַּה}

967 > Heb

{יִפְרְטֹל מָנָעֶה אֲלָלָה מִיִּשְׁמָע עַל כֹּנַּה}

The difference of an extra verb in 967, above the differences in MT and OG-Syh already examined, only serves to complicate the situation here, but it is notable that in אלילוֹ there is a much closer similarity to the consonants of MT ... אלילוֹ than can be found in the retroversion of OG-Syh. The loss or addition of one Lamed is still problematic, as outlined above; cf page 174. Could there have been three alternative readings thus?

{יִפְרְטֹל מָנָעֶה } אֲלָלָה מִיִּשְׁמָע

{תִּטְמוּרָמ הַלָּלָה}

{הַשׁוֹרָד אֲלָלָה מִיִּשְׁמָע}

This is not impossible, but it is probably just as likely that an original contained the sense of MT plus 967 and that sections of text fell out in stages. Before this is explored, further solutions must be considered.

76 There is no standard equivalent in LXX for מַעְנָעָה, but καταφυγή is found in Ps 89 (90):1.
Composite Greek and Hebrew Solution for MT, OG-Syh, P967

A composite of Hebrew and Greek solutions might indicate that in Hebrew there were two dittographies or conflation of three alternative readings, as indicated above, before translation into Greek. Then haplography occurred in Greek based on parablepsis of κατ as explained on page 175, to produce the difference between OG-Syh and 967.

Aramaic Solution for MT, OG-Syh, P967

MT > Aram

אריך על כלם יתורmenoך לאמלא את הילין על מוכנה
יחרימ תקופת召回ה
יחרבה וסינה
יחרבי

OG > Aram

אריך על כלם יתורמנו יתורדו הל עממית הילין על מוכנה

967 > Aram

על כלם יתורמו יתורדו עלהו יתורדו הל עממית הילין על מוכנה
יחרנה

There is potential in the Aramaic retroversion of 967 for haplography through parablepsis, for there are three verbs each beginning with the consonants ...יור', and this applies whether root וו פ or וו פ is used to retrovert גלע. This form of homoioarchon accounts for the loss of επ αυτουζ / עלהו / עלהב from the passage more easily than does homoiooteleuton in Greek. However, it means the difference between two different Old Greek texts would be traced to Aramaic, and this would mean two different Hebrew Vorlagen for them, which does not seem likely. If the discrepancy between OG-Syh and 967 is to be attributed to an Aramaic text, it is more likely that alternative readings produced conflation, and this is easier to imagine with the Aramaic verbs than Hebrew:
There is visual similarity between the verbs חָמָר, חָמָר וַחָמָר, and for a ligature of Dalet and Vav might resemble Mem. The synonyms for חָמָר, חָמָר וַחָמָר, or the form חָמָר וַחָמָר, might also be graphically confused with חָמָר וַחָמָר. However, the loss of Aleph in הָאָלָל is a problem. If the form חָמָר וַחָמָר was behind Hebrew חָמָר, though it might provide an Aleph to link with the suffixed preposition הָל, after a substantial haplography of חָמָר וַחָמָר חָמָר וַחָמָר, the fact is this loss of text is less likely with the orthography חָמָר וַחָמָר because it does not bear a good resemblance to חָמָר וַחָמָר.

The loss of an even larger text could be considered: i.e. an original Semitic text may have been a composite of the meanings represented by MT and P 967.

Hebrew Solution Based on a Combination of MT and P967

The Greek texts are somewhat easier to derive from this than the MT. אֲלָלָה מַעָיִם was lost through parablepsis with וַחָמָר בָּעֵד to give the text underlying P 967:

Homoioarchon due to the similarity of חָמָר וַחָמָר and could have resulted in loss of a verb to give the Hebrew underlying OG-Syh:
This would mean that OG-Syh was corrected to a different Hebrew Vorlage from that of P 967. An alternative would be to assume P967 represents a conflation of two texts of which OG-Syh represents one and the other is lost. These would be based on a dittography in Hebrew:

\[ \text{רואתמרר עליהם} \]

\[ \text{יתרורר אלהי עניים} \]

This confusion, which includes metathesis, is certainly possible, but not simple.

The short text of MT could also derive from this combined text in Hebrew, by a different route.

\[ \text{כעל כל יתנזור יתנזור עליהם יתנזור אלהי עניים עד ענה} \]

All of the extra text represented in P967 could have been lost through parablepsis of the sequences \[7\text{.ל.\text{and.ל.}1} \] (highlighted in bold above). This might seem a slender possibility when there is so much more potential for confusion in other forms in this sentence, but the same parablepsis is needed to explain a two stage loss of text.

\[ \text{כעל כל יתנזור יתנזור עליהם יתנזור אלהי עניים עד ענה} \]

Here the equivalent of 967's unique clause was lost first through homoioioarchon to leave the equivalent of OG-Syh:

\[ \text{כעל כל יתנזור יתנזור אלהי עניים עד ענה} \]

Then the same parablepsis of \[\text{ל}\] and \[\text{ל}\] must be used to explain the difference between OG-Syh and MT.

continued...
Aramaic Solution Based on a Combination of MT and 967

The Greek texts are easier to explain from this source than is the Hebrew of MT.

Firstly לַאֲלַחֵלָה חָלֵלָה עַל

Then parablepsis led to the loss of וַיִּתְמֵר עֵלֵהָד to give the text underlying OG-Syh. There is no potential for a long haplography to explain the difference between MT and P967, as there is in Hebrew.

Parablepsis of the letter sequence לַשׁוּר וְלֹא... and...לַשׁוּר, though metathesis of Vav would be involved, as well as Yod read for Dalet, could have resulted in the loss of וַיִּתְמֵר עֵלֵהָד. Then וַיִּתְמֵר could have fallen out, as above; but this leaves the loss of וַיִּתְרַדְדוּ to account for from the remaining text:

There is no clear graphic confusion or parablepsis that can explain this loss. However, the Hitpeal stem of יָרֵם וְיָרֵם may have been employed rather than the Hitpalpal. (This would not effect previous solutions.)
Here could have been lost by parablepsis due to Mem confused with a ligature of Nun Vav (as highlighted in bold), though the conjunctive Vav must have been reduplicated first. Another way might see this verb the first to go from the long text:

ארי על כל שהרמר ותמרר עליתות ותודה על עמסם ההילן על מענה

This again would involve Dalet read as Yod and metathesis of both He and Lamed, but the confusion could have led to haplography of יתרדן ל הד to leave:

ארי על כל שהרמר ותמרר עליתות עמסם הויילן ואלאל הילן על מענה

After this, עמסם הויילן may have dropped out after confusion and parablepsis of the letter sequences highlighted in bold, though this again includes a number of metatheses along with He read as Het and Ayin as Yod. The remaining text would have been:

ארי על כל שהרמר ותומרר עליתות ואלאל הילן על מענה

The two remaining verbs could have been confused so that the second fell out, or the highlighted letters may have caused parablepsis if Yod resembled Ayin, and Resh lost its upper hook to appear as Vav, but this still leaves עליתות.

Use of ריבי as an alternative to רים is a little better, and this would not affect any of the previous Aramaic solutions, but it would require that two Yods resembled Vavs and that an elongated Vav was mistaken for final Nun.

ארי על כל שהרמר ותמרר עליתות ואלאל הילן על מענה

Clearly the different readings in MT, OG-Syh and P967 could have derived from textual errors of a complicated nature. Although the verb forms would have been
most easily confused in Aramaic, the simplest solution of all explored here is parablepsis in the longest possible Hebrew text, a combination of MT and a retroversion of P967. Other solutions may be achievable with different synonyms from the equivalents for the Greek of 967 used in this study, and composite solutions derived from processes in Hebrew and Aramaic, or Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek are likely to be very complex; but to find a definitive answer to this difficult part of Daniel is not the aim of this exploration. There is no overriding evidence to favour an Aramaic original here.

Has this study thrown any light upon the meaning of the enigmatic phrase in MT, יְרָאֵל הַמְעֹדָה? Certainly a longer text combining the meanings of both MT and OG-Syh (at least) does provide for more flexibility in the meaning of this phrase. Its broad context in MT has its own difficulties. In 11:36 the king will exalt himself over every god and will speak boastfully against the God of gods: v 37 says he will have no respect for the gods/God of his fathers or the one beloved of women, or any other god, but will exalt himself over all. These statements seem to be partially contradicted by v 38 which says he will honour the god/God of fortresses and a god that his fathers did not know, possibly indicating two different gods or one god by two different descriptions.

The broad context in OG with respect to the king’s attitude to deities is the same as MT, but the statement in v 37, that strong nations will be subject to him, intervenes between the sections which state that he will not respect any god in vv36-37, and that he will honour one or two particular gods in v 38. The long text, i.e. a text equivalent to MT and ‘o’, whether OG-Syh or P 967, may have been one without these contradictions if the form יְרָאֵל was originally meant as the plural demonstrative pronoun rather than the noun for ‘god’. This would be the case in both Hebrew and Aramaic, but there is greater potential for a sensible solution in Aramaic because the syntax is more flexible in this language.

As MT of v 38 is pointed, it is easier graphically to read יְרָאֵל for יְרָאֵל than for יְרָאֵל, unless one assumes addition of mater lectiones in the latter; but the
emended reading מִנָּה רָאָשָׁה לָא-רָאָשָׁה אָבָתִים, ‘and these whom his fathers did not know (he will honour... )’ with the antecedent to the pronoun the ‘strong nations’ of OG, is lacking the correct pronoun suffix on the verb, so loss of final Nun from a putative מִנָּה רָאָשָׁה אָבָתִים would have to be adduced. With מִנָּה רָאָשָׁה אָבָתִים, ‘and these strong ones he will honour upon his stand’ (? ) the problem is the relation of מִנָּה to the demonstrative pronoun, and whether it can ever mean ‘strong ones’. It must be construed as a participle, since as a noun modified by an adjective, it would normally precede the adjective, and with the antecedent ‘strong nations’ both would be expected to be definite. The participle can follow the demonstrative pronoun, whether with the definite article or without, where it may often be rendered in English by a relative clause. Additionally here, the demonstrative plural must be read as the direct object of the verb בה: cf similar word order in e.g. Lev 11:13, 22; Num 29:39; Ps 42:5; 50:21. So what is suggested in this case must be the fusion of two idioms that can be found in MT. In addition, מִנָּה as a participle is not attested elsewhere in MT.

A solution is simpler in Aramaic because the particle יִד could be employed and it would be ambiguous in this context:

MT > Aram יִד אֵלֹה הָיִלּ֣וֹן יִכְּרוּ

This sentence could be translated, ‘and a god of fortresses he will honour’, which appears to be the sense of MT; or alternatives could be ‘and these who are strong / a god of strong ones he will honour’. In the second sentence there is no problem of a different consonantal text between מִנָּה and מִנָּה.

Therefore, although the problem of corruption in the larger text leading to different Greek readings may be most easily solved in terms of Hebrew transmission, a

77 The best examples are in questions, e.g. 1 Kgs 18:17; Isa 63:1; Zech 2:4; Job 38:2; 42:3; Cant 3:8; 8:5: others are 1 Kgs 20:7; 2 Kgs 5:7; Cant 2:9, but in all these examples the demonstrative is the subject of its clause. In the hypothetical example above, the demonstrative מִנָּה would be direct object, ‘and these who are strong he will honour’, which seems straightforward when translated into English, but I have found no precedence for such a use of the demonstrative in MT.
different understanding of the phrase which troubled Ginsberg emerges from Aramaic in conjunction with the OG reading.

11:39

The following text combines the ideas of Ginsberg concerning both the verb הושע and the noun מעזרו.

MT

והשע למקברר מציון עם-ኢלוהים זכר

καὶ ποιησαι τοῖς ὁχυρωμασι τῶν καταθυγων μετα θεου ἄλλοτριου

et faciet ut muniat Maozim cum deo alieno

S

καὶ ποιησαι τοῖς ὁχυρωμασι τῶν καταθυγων μετα θεου ἄλλοτριου

OG

καὶ ἐν ἐπιθυμησαι [39] ποιησαι πολεων και εἰς ὁχυρωμα ἵχυρων ήξει μετα θεου ἄλλοτριου

Syh

78 See Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 81, concerning the verse division in OG.
There are five main areas of variation between the above texts to explain.

1) תעש
2) מקצרים מתועים
3) πολέων
4) ήξετ
5) haec

Hebrew Solution

It is notable that the Versions support the MT reading with root הוש. The usual exception is the Peshitta, which employs נאכ: this must, as always, be taken as an internal error.79

OG lacks the conjunction before the verb in question, which necessitates retroversion into an imperfect in Hebrew, rather than perfect with Vav consecutive, and this is joined to the previous verse with the noun πολεων. If the latter had been accusative, it would have read naturally as the direct object of ποιησις, but, since it is genitive

79 This is how Ginsberg, Studies, 49, note a, understood it and also Taylor, The Peshitta, 267, 284.
and does not make sense in its context, it is usually assumed to be a gloss.80 The lack of conjunction may be another example of a Hebrew textual variation, as noted in 11: 17 above, where the Vav consecutive with the perfect has been written as a simple imperfect with no conjunction.

An understanding of the verb חכשא in this context is linked to an understanding of the phrase עב אלוה זכר. MT translates literally as ‘and he will make fortresses of strongholds with a strange god’, reading the particle ל as sign of the direct object: this awkward reading is broadly supported by the Versions in that most of them read the equivalent of ‘with a strange god’. Most modern scholars accept Hitzig’s suggestion to amend the pointing of MT to instead, ‘people of a strange god’, since this fits well the generally accepted historical allusion to the bringing of foreigners (Syrians) to settle in Judaea, particularly the Akra in Jerusalem.81 The consonants of MT עב אלוה זכר are supported by all the Versions, but this confusion between preposition עב and construct noun עב is possible in Aramaic as well as Hebrew.

b) Aramaic Solution

Zimmermann related the verb to the Aramaic root מלח and translated ‘and he shall do battle against the fortified strongholds’, but he did not enlarge upon his reading of the rest of the verse. None of the Versions support such a reading of the text, and as noted in other contexts, this idea does not contribute any evidence of a written Aramaic text behind the Hebrew.

Ginsberg accepted the emendation of Hitzig and retroverted חכשא to Aramaic נלביר, meaning ‘he will bring over’, which he maintained was misread as נלבר, Peal

80 Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 208 marks this word as a gloss, and it was accepted as such by Montgomery, A Critical, 464; and Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 91; cf page 197.
‘he will make’.\textsuperscript{82} This conveniently gave the reading ‘he will bring over a people of a strange god’. Hartman adopted this idea, translating ‘he will bring over soldiers of a strange god’.\textsuperscript{83}

Jerome noted a text of Theodotion with the variant reading aget.\textsuperscript{84} This at first reading appears to support Ginsberg’s understanding of יְנָשַׁה as deriving from Aramaic הגבר, but the Latin verb in this context is simply a synonym of faciet. Latin agere has a much wider semantic range than the Greek cognate ἀγεῖν, and, followed by the final clause ut muniat, it has the sense ‘he will pursue this action that he might fortify’.\textsuperscript{85} In recording this variant it was the term haec to which Jerome wanted to draw attention, and not the verb.

If, as Ginsberg suggested, the Aramaic behind MT was יְנָשַׁה, the OG verb ποιησεν would retrovert to Aramaic הגבר: this could have occurred due to the loss of Vav from יְנָשַׁה. So following Ginsberg’s lead, retroversions to Aramaic would be:

\begin{align*}
\text{MT} & > \text{Aram} \quad \text{גָּנֵב} \\
\text{OG} & > \text{Aram} \quad \text{גָּנֵב} \\
\text{Ginsberg's} & > \text{Aram} \quad \text{גָּנֵב}
\end{align*}

Clearly the Aramaic suggested by Ginsberg could be a source of corruption into a text agreeing with the MT verb, since it would suppose only the confusing of Dalet and Resh. So in favour of Ginsberg’s thesis, that Aramaic גנֵב was corrupted to

\textsuperscript{82} Ginsberg, Studies, 49, (h): there appear to be some errors in his note a, quoting the Syriac as יְנָשַׁה, and the Hebrew as יְנָשַׁה, but the argument of his main point in (h) still holds good.

\textsuperscript{83} Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 260.

\textsuperscript{84} Pontificii Editores, S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera, Pars I: Opera Exegetica 5: \textit{Commentaria in Danielem Libri III} <iv> (1964, Turnholti Typographi), 928.

\textsuperscript{85} David F Wright has drawn my attention to the reading of Porphyry, et faciet haec omnia ut muniat, which underlines the interchangeability of facere and agere in this context. Cf ibid.
and gave rise to ועשת ויעבד in Hebrew, is the simplicity of a common textual error; but there is no reliable textual evidence to support him.

2) מַבְצָרִי מַעְזָה

This reading is awkwardly pleonastic and it is not surprising that the Versions exhibit some deviation from the received text. There are broadly four different readings including MT. The retroversions into Hebrew above are literal, in that they include a definite article where one was used in Greek and as the equivalent of Syriac emphatic endings, but the versions concerned may have been translating freely, and so the inclusion or exclusion of an article may not be significant.

Theodotion is close to MT, but with the use of the definite article: the variant in the Vulgate and Jerome’s Theodotion, ut muniat, seems to support a reading מַמְמֻצֶר where the first noun was probably read as a gerund, ‘for the fortifying of’ (perhaps as a Hiphil participle), or it could have been taken as infinitive: the Peshitta has a definite plural noun followed by an adjective in agreement: OG with Syro-Hexapla similarly has a noun with adjective in agreement, but they are singular.

Concerning number in the phrase, whilst MT and Theodotion witness to a plural construct noun with a plural following, the Peshitta has two plurals in apposition (noun and adjective), and OG supported by the Syro-hexapla has two singulars in apposition (also noun and adjective). The reading in Theodotion’s variant and the Vulgate stands between these, in that they witness to a singular followed by a plural.
The unpointed Hebrew below illustrates how plural forms could have developed from singulars, or vice versa:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Peshitta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S &gt; Heb</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי קְנֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי קְנֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, θ Hi &gt; Heb</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG &gt; Heb</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
<td>לְמַכְּרֵי מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adjectives in OG and the Peshitta could be the equivalent of either Hebrew adjective מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה \ נ or a noun read as adjective מִנְּוֵי עֵמֶּֽה \ מַכְּרֵי עֵמֶּֽה. Since Ayin could be confused with Yod, it is possible that the difference between the singular of OG and the plurals of the other texts is due to confusion with עֵמֶּֽה \ עֵמֶּֽה following, leading to either a haplography or dittography of two consonants עֵמֶּֽה. This would assume the use of matres lectionis. Without them, all the texts except OG have the same consonants, but the difference between the plural construct in MT and the plural absolute noun witnessed by the Peshitta is difficult to explain without them. This would suggest some early difference(s) in word division followed by use of matres lectiones and subsequently more differences in word division.

The phrase in MT being so unusual, it is probable that one of the Versions preserves the original text. It is difficult to trace a development from the Vorlage of OG to the other texts unless יִשְׁעַנְנֵּֽו and not יִשְׁעַנְנֵּֽו is the original behind יִשְׁעַנְנֵּֽו, but the Peshitta preserves a reading that would easily give rise to the others. However the phrases that employ adjectives are tautological; unless the Hebrew is understood to indicate a

---

86 For consideration of the source of OG יִשְׁעַנְנֵּֽו see 4) below, pages 202-3: it has been omitted from retroversion at this point in the analysis for reasons stated in that section.

87 Cf also 11:38, page 142.
superlative, ‘the strongest fortress / fortresses’. It may be, for the sense of the phrase, the text preserved by Jerome is superior and that its Vorlage preserves the original, which without matres lectionis would have a Hiphil participle or infinitive. Alternatively it may have been a Piel infinitive רעב, ‘to fortify’, and Mem may have arisen as a reduplication before Bet.

b) Aramaic Solution

Ginsberg believed that Aramaic מַעְעֶה, ‘pious ones’, lay behind the Hebrew מַעְעֶה, and that the translator had misread the Aramaic text as מַעְעֶה, ‘strongholds’ but, as in v 38, there is no textual evidence to support the sense ‘pious ones’. However the Aramaic adjective מַעְעֶה means ‘strong, hard’ and this is exactly the meaning that is evident in OG ṭεχανος, and the Peshitta מַעְעֶה. These two witnesses could support textual confusion in Aramaic between the adjective, singular מַעְעֶה, plural מַעְעֶה, both meaning ‘strong’, and the noun מַעְעֶה, meaning ‘strongholds’. Without matres lectionis these last two words are homographs, and the first has only one less Nun than the others. Ginsberg may have been correct in his assumption that some form of root מַעְעֶה lay behind Hebrew מַעְעֶה, but he chose the wrong meaning, ‘pious ones’, based on his own interpretation of the text, instead of being guided by the versions that supply the sense ‘strong’.

To put this into the context of a broader study it is necessary to look at all the terms which could have been employed in Aramaic for ‘fort / fortress’ and for ‘stronghold’. There are five words / word groups which fulfil this criterion:

---

88 Jeansonne translates this way; see below page 197.
89 Ginsberg, Studies, 49, (h) and note a. Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 260, adopted this translation.
90 In fact the meaning ‘pious one’ for מַעְעֶה is not commonly attested in Jewish Aramaic, though it is found in Syriac: see Ja, Vol 1, 487 where only the senses ‘strong, hard’ are listed; P/S, Tomus 1, 1325; PS, 150.
i) יִלָּעַס, plural יִלֶּעַס, אֹלוֹס, from the root יֵלָשׁ to ‘be strong’, is the prime term likely to be the basis for Hebrew מבצר.

ii) This study has already noted יִלְגָּל, יִלְגָּל, יֵלֶגָּל, which can indicate a fortress; particularly it was noted that יִלְגָּל may be used of the Akra.91

iii) יִיּוֹס, יִיּוֹס, יִיּוֹס, plural יִיּוֹס, יִיּוֹס, יִיּוֹס, יִיּוֹס, denotes a ‘fortified place, city, capital’ and is the standard equivalent of Hebrew מבצר, which indicates a fortified settlement.

iv) יָסָר m, ‘fort, stronghold’, and, יָסָר, יָסָר, יָסָר, f, ‘net, fort’, both from root יָסָר, might be considered general terms more likely to underlie the Hebrew מבצר, but they do not have the same potential as יִלָּעַס to be confused with a word meaning ‘strong’.

v) יָסָר, יָסָר, יָסָר, f, generally means ‘town’, but can sometimes mean ‘fort’. It is the standard equivalent of Hebrew מבצר, and also cognate with Hebrew מַעָלִים, which can also mean ‘fort’. יָסָר occurs with this sense in Targ 2 Sam 24:7, cf BCTP, where it is equivalent to מבצר, and also to מַעָלִים in Targ Jer 21:13, the referents being either Jerusalem or Tyre.

Aramaic equivalents of Hebrew מבצר and מבצר which make use of the most common synonyms would be יָסָר and יָסָר. Using these equivalents to retrovert the phrase as found in MT and all the main ancient Versions would produce the following Aramaic to compare to the retroversions into Hebrew:

continued...
When the same allowances are made as in Hebrew for freedom of translation and possible lack of matres lectionis, there is definitely potential for misreading or miscopying the term מַסְתִּן, but יָרָךְ does not compare favourably with Hebrew מַבּאֶרוּן for likely consonantal confusion. E.g. in the above retroversion of the Peshitta to Hebrew מַבּאֶרוּן could easily be the cause or result of some corruption with the initial consonant Mem in הַכַּנֵּינָה; but the same cannot be said for the Aramaic ending יָרָךְ and the initial consonant מַסְתִּן in the retroversion of the Peshitta to Aramaic. An argument could be made that Yod followed by Nun was confused with Het, just as such a confusion has been suggested for Vav followed by Nun with Tav; but since the Hebrew solution involves misreading or miscopying of the same consonant, Mem, it is more probable than one using Aramaic יָרָךְ.

Retroversion of מַבּאֶרוּן to the Aramaic noun הַכַּנֵּינָה:

| MT > Aram | הַכַּנֵּינָה | MT | מַבּאֶרוּן |
| θ > Aram | הַכַּנֵּינָה | θ > Heb | מַבּאֶרוּן |
| V, θ Hi > Aram | הַכַּנֵּינָה | V, θ Hi > Heb | מַבּאֶרוּן |
| OG > Aram | הַכַּנֵּינָה | OG > Heb | מַבּאֶרוּן |
| S > Aram | הַכַּנֵּינָה | S > Heb | מַבּאֶרוּן |

The Aramaic synonym הַכַּנֵּינָה has the same potential as מַסְתִּן, if not more, for confusion, since יָרָךְ can mean both ‘strong’ (masculine plural absolute), and

---

91 Cf page 144.
‘fortresses’, or it could be confused with רהוב, ‘fortresses’. The OG equivalent לִשְׁרוּת, ‘strong’, however, is more problematical in the absolute form. Emphatic states would be easier to confuse: singular כְּרַךְ and plural כְּרַךְ, if linked with בָּרֶךְ.

If either כְּרַךְ or כְּרַךְ is taken as the Aramaic behind Hebrew מחץ, then the potential to confuse singular and plural in the consonantal texts of either feminine noun is obvious; but a complication is that an adjective following would have a feminine form. Taking כְּרַךְ as an example, the emphatic forms of the feminine noun would be the same consonantally in both singular and plural, for כְּרַךְ could be pointed כְּרַךְ, singular, or כְּרַךְ, plural, and the construct forms are similarly ambiguous when unpointed. With בָּרֶךְ, retroversions might be as follows:

| MT, 0 > Aram | לְכַרְתָּה יִהלְלָה |
| V, 0 Hi > Aram | לְכַרְתָּה יִיהֲלָה |
| OG > Aram | לְכַרְתָּה יִיהֲלָה |
| S > Aram | כְּרַךְ חֲלוֹלָה |

With the adjectives in OG and the Peshitta, confusion between singular and plural is found in the consonants of the emphatic state as also between the nouns: it is additionally possible that a final Aleph of the emphatic noun was lost before Het to produce the construct form כְּרַךְ underlying MT and possibly V, 0 Hi. The absolute singular feminine adjective כְּרַךְ has potential for confusion with כְּרַךְ. Even plural absolute כְּרַךְ has potential to be confused with a construct form, for Tav can be formed from a ligature of Vav followed by Nun. The emphatic adjective would, however, be a problem, since there is little reason why Tav should be lost or acquired between כְּרַךְ and כְּרַךְ. Even to argue that Tav in the emphatic adjective was confused with Yod and Nun of absolute noun כְּרַךְ would not account for the loss of Aleph at the end of the adjective.
Another alternative is to explore other genitive constructions, with use of a construct noun, as they might represent possible Vorlagen of MT and Theodotion thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MT} & > \text{Aram} & \text{קרוח דחיין} & \text{ברכית דՐסניִן} \\
\theta & > \text{Aram} & \text{קרוחתא דוהליי} & \text{ברכית דوءסיִניִן}
\end{align*}
\]

These constructions do not exhibit any potential for confusion between singular and plural above what has already been observed in the ambiguous form of קדורתא, for neither Aleph nor Nun are easily confused with Dalet in any style of script.

When the potential for textual errors in this phrase in Hebrew or Aramaic is assessed, there is little to choose between the two languages: the balance of probability is about equal. However, the problem of tautology must still be addressed.

**Tautology and the Hebrew**

Based on retroversions to Hebrew on page 189, it is possible to argue that the second word, בְּמַעַיִן, is not original, but an accretion gathered from textual errors associated with original ... לָמַבְּצֵר עֵמ. It has already been noted that עֵמ may have been confused with the plural suffix ד. A badly written Resh could be mistaken for Zayin, and Ayin could be confused with Tsade, even in a style where Ayin was written as small as a Yod, if the down-stroke of Tsade was difficult to discern. It is possible OG represents the oldest text, in which this process was incomplete. Beginning without matres lectionis, the stages could have been as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Original ?} & & \text{לָמַבְּצֵר עֵמ} \\
\text{OG} & > \text{Heb} & \text{לָמַבְּצֵר מַעַיִן עֵמ}^{94} \\
\text{V, 0 Hi} & > \text{Heb} & \text{לָמַבְּצֵר מַעַיִן עֵמ} \\
\text{S} & > \text{Heb} & \text{לָמַבְּצֵר מַעַיִן עֵמ} \\
\text{MT} & & \text{לָמַבְּצֵר מַעַיִן עֵמ}
\end{align*}
\]

---

92 Cf page 135.
93 Cf e.g. Cross, ‘The Development’, 137, figs 2, 3 and later scripts.
Tautology and the Aramaic

Study of the above retroversions into Aramaic will show that there is not the same potential for the second term in the tautological phrase developing through textual error; however it is possible that the second term is due to conflation.

Both the Aramaic nouns קָרוֹת הָיוֵלָה and קָרוֹת הָיוֵלָה are ambiguous since they can each denote an ordinary settlement, ‘city, town, or a ‘fortified settlement’. If there was a single term in Aramaic which was ambiguous and needed clarification to indicate a fort, this could have been a singular or plural term. If a reference to the Akra is most likely, then the term would be singular, and this would point to OG as the nearest to the original.

Any of the following couplets could have arisen from this process:

קרות הווילאה
 carro'h vililah

קרות הווילא
 carro'h wileh

קרות הווילא
 carro'h wileh

קרות הווילא
 carro'h wileh

or any of the above repeated with ליליא instead of ליליא.

On the other hand, one term in Aramaic which was ambiguous may have been rendered with two alternatives by the translator into Hebrew. Two absolutes could have been supplied and these would have developed on lines similar to those envisaged in Hebrew, above.

Another solution would be a phrase similar to the one in Targ Mic 2:13, , where the adjective confirms the fortified nature of the towns: in this case it would be רכבי הוויליא, and perhaps a translator mistook the adjective הוויליא as a plural emphatic noun in apposition.

For הִכְנָץ cf page 189, note 86.
It is notable, in this context, that Aramaic evidences pairs of words where one would be adequate, though these are generally linked by a conjunction.\textsuperscript{95} It is possible that such a pair of singular nouns in Aramaic developed into plurals: the first becoming plural construct when the conjunction was misread as Yod; the second is more likely to have become plural in Hebrew as suggested above; cf page 189. However such pairs are found in Hebrew too,\textsuperscript{96} and could be regarded as Aramaisms. If this is the case in 11:39, the development from singular to plural could have been entirely in Hebrew.

There is the further possibility that one of two terms in Aramaic was misunderstood. לְמִבְצָרֵי מְעִיתֵן can mean ‘storehouse’ and plural לְמִבְצָרֵי מְעִיתֵן without vowel letters would be ambiguous. The phrase could have been כְּבַרְכֵי חָסִית, literally ‘cities of storehouses’. This meaning would connect with the precious items listed in v 38, for which the king ‘made’ secure storehouses, or which he ‘brought’ to them, if Ginsberg’s thesis was correct.

There is a plethora of ways to explain MT לְמִבְצָרֵי מְעִיתֵן in both Hebrew and Aramaic, far too many to be sure of the real solution.

3) \textit{πολεων}

OG represents a longer reading with πολεων καὶ and ἡξει, which have no equivalent in MT. πολεων is usually assumed a gloss, and this is supported by the different position given to its equivalent in the Syro-Hexapla, ἐργαζόμενοι. Its position in OG is probably the original, because it is less likely that a gloss would be removed to a position where it made no sense than to one where it did.

continued...

\textsuperscript{95} J C Greenfield & M Sokoloff, ‘The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Aramaic Vocabulary’, \textit{SQA, 95-6}
a) Hebrew Solution

The noun πολεον, according to Montgomery, is a gloss of יזיו,97 presumably because the genitive plural form could only logically apply to this Hebrew word in the MT phrase under consideration. Jeansonne thinks that it is an alternative reading to מִבְצָר, thus:98

'The doublet πολεον is probably based on an alternative Hebrew reading ( "fortified city, cities" for לְמִבְצָר "with the strongest [fortress]", a phrase found in Num 32:17, 36; Josh 10:20; 19:29, 35; 1 Sam 6:18; 2 Kgs 3:19; 10:2; 17:9; 18:8; Jer 4:5; 5:17; 8:14; 37:4;99 Ps 108:11; 2 Chr 17:19; Dan 11:15. The word of this phrase was translated with πολεον "city".100 Perhaps, originally the marginal gloss read εις πολεος οχυρας ιςχυον "to a fortified, strong city", and was not added to the text properly. Moreover, when this reading was added to the OG, the κατ, which was probably added before ποιησει ( κατ ποιησει = יזיו) was misplaced.'

Clearly there is precedence in MT for the phrase יזיו or מִבְצָר, but the second element is usually singular.101 The first element is construct and therefore cannot be accurately rendered by a Greek genitive case. The 'original gloss' which Jeansonne suggests appears to suppose that the Greek preposition εις takes the genitive case, but it only takes the accusative; such a gloss would have to read εις

96 Ibid.
97 See Montgomery, A Critical, 464; Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 208, parenthesises the word. The Syro-Hexapla places this gloss in a more logical position, probably a secondary development, and an attempt to make sense of all the words in OG.
98 Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 91.
99 Sic Jeansonne, but the phrase is not found in this verse.
100 Sic Jeansonne again: it is not clear why her translation is singular; but perhaps her gloss belongs after יזיו!
101 There is a plural in Dan 11:15, מִבְצָר, but this is unique and must be treated as a separate problem from the phrase in 11:39.
πολίν ὅχυραν ἰσχυραν. It must also be assumed that the gloss has mistakenly been written as a plural as well as changing case. The Hebrew equivalent of Jeansonne’s suggested gloss might be יעי מברך מביעה.

In the above retroversions to Hebrew, the Peshitta has been retroverted to מבצרות which has the same consonants as MT with a different word division, and it is possible that the term יעי was unclear and יעריב was an alternative reading. However, this plural gloss appears in the OG text, which is the only recension in which both terms are singular. These could have developed from haplographies after the text became conflate: the ב... of יעי may have fallen out before יע. On the other hand, conflation of readings יעי and יעריב could indicate that a copyist, or the Greek translator in the case of πολέων, was unsure from the text whether a plural or singular term was indicated. In other words the confusing terms were terms יעי and יעריב. All these considerations support Montgomery rather than Jeansonne in the matter of the OG gloss, in that it was far more likely applied to מבצרות or whatever gave rise to this Hebrew, than to מבצרות or its precursor.

b) Aramaic Solution

The possibility of a conflate text in Aramaic which explicates some form of one of the ambiguous nouns כær or קרה as either ליל or חסן has been explored. Could the ambiguity of the Aramaic terms, which denote either a town or a fort, be the source of the Greek πολέων? Clearly the most obvious candidate for the source in Aramaic is the feminine emphatic noun קחרpañ because this consonantal form could be either singular or plural, and therefore could theoretically be the source of either singular or plural terms, but the Greek word is plural. Thus an original קחרpañ, since it is doubly ambiguous, that is semantically and in number, could be the source of alternative readings which were recorded in either Aramaic or Hebrew. In Aramaic these could have been מדרינת, which could be singular or plural, חוזל, חוזל, חוזל, חוזל.
Whichever of these terms was used could have been translated into Hebrew, or the translator, faced with the ambiguity in the Aramaic text, could have used any of these alternatives to translate it:

הכותרת, המבטה,
מהות, מועה,
עיר, עיר.

The use of two alternative meanings from which the reader had to choose would explain why the Greek translator chose the genitive case, if e.g. by the time the OG Vorlage was received it read

עיר

מבטה, מועה

The Aramaic word could also have been a source of semantic ambiguity, but it does not have the same potential for confusion of number and would mean that the original must have been a plural form thus:

עיר

מכתבת, מכתש

or

ברכיה וtilityא

leading to

מכתבת מכתש

Mubat, Mutsch.

Substantives that were singular in Aramaic could have developed into plurals after translation into Hebrew because of textual errors described above, thus:

מכתבת מכתש, מכתש

or

ברכיה וtilityא

leading to

מכתבת מכתש

Mubat, Mutsch.

It can be seen that the one noun in Aramaic בְּרֶכֶר or כּוֹרֶה, could furnish a reason for the difference in readings with singular and plural nouns, and for the OG gloss, πολεύονων; but there is a drawback to this idea. It assumes that the Hebrew translator not only translated Aramaic glosses or supplied two alternative readings in a double Hebrew gloss, but also chose to translate the original Aramaic word itself as מכתב / מכתב rather than as עיר.
The fact that both OG and Peshitta employ an adjective meaning ‘strong’ must also be explained. Since in each case this is the second term, and the gloss πολεμων makes better sense when understood as explicating the second term, this would suggest there is a connection between the gloss, the adjectives and the term מְנַוֶּים, ‘strongholds’. The Aramaic noun קָרוֹן does not provide such a connection as it is not associated semantically with the idea of strength. The Aramaic root רוֹל would supply semantically the idea of strength and of a stronghold,\textsuperscript{102} but not the connection with πολις. Nonetheless the Aramaic term קָרוֹן, since it is ambiguous, might supply a reason for an alternative word which could have been misplaced and misunderstood by the translator of OG.

That it is possible to trace a composite Aramaic and Hebrew solution can be illustrated by the following stages.

1) Original Aramaic קָרוֹן meaning ‘the fort / forts’
2) Aramaic glossed as plural קֹלוֹת meaning ‘strongholds’
3) Gloss incorporated as couplet קֹלוֹת קֹלוֹת
4) Couplet translated into Hebrew קֹלוֹת קֹלוֹת = לֶמֶבֶץ רְשָׁעִים
5) Haplography of Mem before He לֶמֶבֶץ רְשָׁעִים = 0
6) Haplography of He before Mem לֶמֶבֶץ רְשָׁעִים = MT
7) Different word division לֶמֶבֶץ וְשׁוֹעַים = S, (gloss עַרְוִים added above עֲשֻׂים ?)
8) Haplography of Yod לֶמֶבֶץ וְשׁוֹעַים = V, 0 Hi
   > different word division
9) Haplography of וב. before לֶמֶבֶץ מִטְעַה = OG, Syh (gloss retained)

\textsuperscript{102} Cf pages 192-3.
This example is obviously simplistic and there are different permutations that are possible. A Hebrew translation at stage 4 without matres lectiones might give rise to a slightly different order of stages: more than one stage may take place in one copying of a manuscript: this paradigm relies on haplography as the main source of variation in the text, whereas the process may have been far more complex with both haplographies and ditto modifications. The paradigm also tends to favour a development from a long reading to a short one, whereas it may be preferable to begin with a short and assume the evolution of long forms.103

There must also be the possibility of variant Aramaic texts developing before translation into Hebrew, or of different Hebrew translations of the same ambiguous Aramaic text.

Although it is possible to explain the gloss πολεων in Hebraic terms, Aramaic expressions have more potential to explain the tautology ‘fortresses of strongholds’ or ‘a strong fort’.

---

103 The model is of course a simplified one and it may seem unsatisfactory to some to suggest the OG recension could be the latest, since it is generally considered the earliest translation, but a textual history may be far too complex to make a simplistic correlation, i.e. that the earliest translation represents the earliest variant. Each stage above marks the beginning of a variant text which then must have its own independent and parallel history from the original and from other recensions. It is not known how long or short a time (either historically or in terms of the number of copies made) elapsed between each stage. Whether any translation represents an early or late recension...
There is no obvious textual explanation for the OG הָּעִיר, in either Hebrew or Aramaic, but the following are some explorations of the possibilities.

a) Hebrew Solution

The Hebrew הָּעִיר is the standard equivalent of Hebrew אֱלֵיר. It has already been noticed that there could have been confusion between the noun בְּּוֹ and the plural ending בְּּוָי which may account for the difference between the singular ῬΩΧΥΡΩΝ in OG, the equivalent of מְּדֻדִּים / הַעִיר and MT מְּדֻדִּים. This account of textual misreading assumed that OG Vorlage read בְּּוֹ and that בְּּוָי was lacking. If, however, it was בְּּוֹ that was lacking, the OG Vorlage would have been the equivalent of מְּדֻדִּים and misreading of Mem as Bet and dittography of Aleph could have produced מְּדֻדִּים מְּדֻדִּים. If this was the case the OG would represent a conflate reading of the two alternatives אֱלֵיר and בְּּוֹ.

b) Aramaic Solution

The Greek verb is the equivalent of Aramaic יָעַל and there is no obvious textual reason that would lead to this reading in an Aramaic Vorlage. Yet the following is notable: the consonants of a Hebrew retroversion of this Greek verb and of Aramaic יָעַל would be the same, אָבָב. It is possible that OG bears witness to an alternative verb in the Hebrew, explicating the main verb of this clause. That is, OG הָּעִיר could be a translation of a Hebrew אָבָב which was read as אָבָב, but which should have been read as אָבָב. The latter was the alternative reading to the verb יָעַל because the verb in Aramaic was unclear and could have read יָעַל or יָעַל. It is notable that this gloss could not have arisen in this form if the Aramaic verb was prefixed with

depends entirely on the Vorlage(n) available at the time and place of translation.
the conjunction, as in an equivalent of MT, which would be לְעִבְרָה/וּתְעִבְרָה, since the
gloss would have been לְעֵבֶרֵא with Vav consecutive and a perfect which could not
have been easily misread

5) haec

This word in Jerome’s Theodotion citation is part of the variant text which reads, et
aget haec ut muniat praesidia. Here haec appears to refer back to the list of
valuable items with which a god will be honoured in v 38, or to the actions of the
king in honouring gods.

a) Hebrew solution

Haec, ‘these’, retroverts to Hebrew לְעֵבֶרֵא or לְעֵבֶרֵא and there is little in MT that would
indicate how this reading came about, though it has been previously noted that the
consonants of the demonstrative pronoun are the same as לְעֵבֶרֵא without mater
lectionis. Yet there is no clue in the text as to why these consonants would be
displaced.

b) Aramaic solution

There is even less likelihood of a solution in Aramaic, in a retroverted text that
would be

וָעִבְרָה לְעֵבֶרֵא לְעֵבֶרֵא עַמַּיְת לְעֵבֶרֵא

לָחֶסֵנט

It is therefore likely that haec is Jerome’s interpretative addition, where he was
trying to make sense of a difficult text, possibly forced because the Vorlage appeared
to have an infinitive for the MT reading לְמֶבוֹצָרִי.
Summary of Analysis of Ginsberg’s Evidence

In general favour of Ginsberg’s theory is the verb הוביר which occurs only twice in the Hebrew of Dan 8-12, when the subject of military / geographical movements might point to a more frequent use of this verb; in contrast הוה is often found where it seems superfluous to the meaning. It is notable that these odd uses of הוה occur in chs 8 and 11, which are most concerned with the above subjects. Of the eight texts examined it was found that for five the sense of הוביר gave a superior reading to הוה; in 8:12, 24; 11:28, 30, 39.

Of the five references where הוביר definitely gave the better reading, it was noted that in 8:12, 24 הוה in MT is linked with the verb אָלַל, which may parallel the verb רעון: and in 11:28, 30 it is linked in context with the verbs בּוּר and with which רעון is also linked in 11:10, 40. It was found that there is no external textual evidence to support the theory of Ginsberg, and similarly of Zimmermann, concerning the verb הוה, but in five references, 8:12, 24; 11:7, 17, 39 the Peshitta exhibits an internal error of רעון for בּוּר which illustrates the common textual error on which Ginsberg based his theory.

Ginsberg’s theory that Aramaic רעון, meaning ‘pious ones’, was the source of Hebrew עָבַד in 11:38, 39 was also examined and it was found that the context does not require this meaning and there is no textual evidence to support this sense, but in 11:39 there is textual evidence for the reading רעון meaning ‘strong’. However, the study found the following examples where an Aramaic textual error provided an explanation for a variant:

11:6 for MT תִּהְפָּכֵר וּבָה and OG ἀξεία αὐτῶν
11:31 for MT נְמוֹדֶרֶשׁ וְהַמֶּשֶׁת and OG το ύγιον του θοβου
11:38 for MT הָלַל and OG ὑποταγησται αὐτο
Three examples were found in which the Hebrew gave a textual solution:

11:6 for MT מַלְךָ and OG βασιλείαν
11:32 for MT יָדִיעַ אֲלִלְיהֵי and OG ὁ γινώσκων ταύτα
11:38 for MT מַעְיֹם and OG ἔθνη ἴσχυρα

One text yielded a superior Hebrew solution but the Aramaic was also good:

11:7 for MT בֹּה and OG ταραχην
Zimmermann’s Evidence, and Textual Study: Part 1

8:8 ותעלנה חות

MT ותעלנה חות אברע

θ ἄνεβη κερατα τεσσαρα

OG & και ἄνεβη ἐτερα τεσσαρα κερατα

967 Syh אֶתִּירנָא שַׁבְיָן

S יְשֶׁה שַׁבְיָנוּי

V et orta sunt cornua quattuor

As MT stands, the plural verb is difficult, since there is no feminine plural subject; but the feminine numeral ‘four’ perhaps indicates that a plural noun has dropped out or should be understood. The expression may have been תְרוּתָה קֶרָתָה, in which case the construct plural noun was lost. All the versions except the Peshitta witness the plural noun that may be absent from MT, but it is not clear if this reflects their Vorlagen or the additions of the translators to clarify the meaning of the clause.¹

The Versions are not a great help regarding the verb: the Greek translations have singular verbs because κερατα is neuter plural; the singular verb of the Peshitta could have been in its Vorlage, or it could reflect the feminine plural verb as it was pronounced (otherwise it would witness the reverse of MT, i.e. a singular verb with a plural subject in the relative phrase).

¹ Contrast 8:3 where MT reads מִשְׁלְכֵנִים מְבוֹא, but where OG has only one equivalent noun.
The equivalent of מִדָּמָה is absent from Theodotion and the Vulgate, and this leads some scholars to assume it is a gloss under the influence of the same word in v 5.\(^3\) Zimmermann’s observation, that the sentence would read more smoothly without מִדָּמָה,\(^3\) could have been recognised by the translators of the Versions and they may have omitted it as superfluous, or it may have fallen out of the Vorlagen for the same reason. Yet the OG variant אֶתְסָפָא suggests that there was some term in the Semitic text which became corrupted, and this reading has been accepted by some modern scholars as original, retroverted to Hebrew תַּדָּרָא.\(^4\)

Zimmermann’s retroversion to יָסָכָה קָחָה קָרָה קָרָה assumed the translator read the verb as third feminine plural perfect יָסָכָה, instead of feminine singular participle יָכָה, which was the correct reading, and which should have been translated as Hebrew תַּדָּרָא instead of יָסָכָה.\(^5\)

Ginsberg, on the other hand, retroverted מִדָּמָה to a passive participle plural, מֵקְנִי, ‘visible ones’.\(^6\) Hartman followed Ginsberg, suggesting that the Aramaic feminine passive participle plural was translated by Hebrew תַּדָּרָא, plural of מִדָּמָה,\(^7\) which was corrupted to the singular.

It must be observed that lack of agreement in number between the verb and מִדָּמָה could be due to a problem with either word, whereas Zimmermann explored the solution only in terms of the verb. Nevertheless, מֵקְנִי could be retroverted to Aramaic as the conjunction with either a perfect verb or a narrative participle, so his

---

\(^2\) Collins, Daniel, 325 note 26; Montgomery, A Critical, 332. Bevan, A Short Commentary, 131, followed Graetz in this view.

\(^3\) Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 21; ‘the Aramaic’, 268, E.


\(^5\) Cf page 71.

\(^6\) Ibid.

\(^7\) This plural follows the convention of מִדָּמָה קָרָה in 8:22.
idea that a singular participle and a plural perfect tense, both feminine, have been confused has a basis in normal Aramaic syntax.

Ginsberg’s objection, that the eastern form of the feminine plural perfect would be unknown to the Jewish translator, seems invalid, since it is found in BA, and his comment assumed that Jews in the Greek empire had no contact with those in Babylon.

However, Hartman’s suggestion of a double error blows away Zimmermann’s theory, for in positing a corruption from a Hebrew plural תָּרִים to a singular, he removed any necessity for Aramaic in the solution! The simple loss of a Yod from the noun in Hebrew would explain entirely why a plural verb has been stranded with a singular subject.

Nevertheless the solution in Aramaic would be even simpler, for Zimmermann’s retroversion to Aramaic evidences a double ambiguity: besides the problem with the verb which he outlined, the construct of the feminine substantive יָאשְׁנָה could be either singular or plural. The phrase וַתְּמַלְמוּת אֶלָּבָע could have been carelessly translated using a singular Hebrew noun in the construct instead of a plural.

None of this addresses the problem of the OG variant זָרֶפַּה, which has been retroverted to Hebrew תְּרִים, meaning ‘others’ (i.e. horns). Certainly the last four consonants of this word could easily be confused with תְּרַה, for it is simply a case of the similarity between Resh and Zayin. The occurrence of Aleph is more difficult to account for, unless the verbal form תְּרַהלֵנוּ was used, and the Aleph was reduplicated.

---

8 Ros, 60; 43; 12, #12.
and attached to the word following.\textsuperscript{9} 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} 65:17 evidences such a verb, יָתַּלְתָּ,\textsuperscript{10} so this form is attested in Hebrew orthography.

Relevant orthography with final Aleph instead of He is also found in Aramaic: 1QapGen 22:28 has the third feminine plural perfect form שלמה\textsuperscript{11} and the feminine singular participles דָּמָו in 2:14; מְנוֹלָא in 2:18; חֲרֵשת in 20:17.\textsuperscript{12}

Retroversion of אָרוֹן to Aramaic is not easy since a feminine absolute plural form for יָתָלְתָּ does not seem to be attested,\textsuperscript{13} but it would presumably be אָדוֹרָנְא(?). feminine forms of the masculine word דָּמָו are דָּמָו אָדוֹרָנְא, אָדוֹרָנְא דָּמָו אָדוֹרָנְא.\textsuperscript{14} So absolute plural forms may have been אָדוֹרָנְא or אָדוֹרָנְא, of which אָדוֹרָנְא, if it ever existed, would give the closest graphic resemblance to אָדוֹרָנְא א... .

Aramaic retroversion of the clause in OG, שלֶלֶמַא אָדוֹרָנְא אָדוֹרָנְא, does not seem to provide as good a solution in terms of textual confusion with שלֶלֶמַא אָדוֹרָנְא אָדוֹרָנְא as the textual solution in Hebrew described above.

So Hebrew seems to provide the simplest answer to the variation between MT and OG, accepting that the orthography for the verbal ending in a manuscript was Aleph: in this scheme דָּמָו אָדוֹרָנְא אָדוֹרָנְא became in one reading דָּמָו אָדוֹרָנְא אָדוֹרָנְא ( = MT with Aleph for He), and in another reading דָּמָו אָדוֹרָנְא אָדוֹרָנְא ( which represents the OG Vorlage ).

\textsuperscript{9} Aleph and He were similar in some scripts; cf page 251, note 9; but as silent letters in final position in a word, it is more probable that common interchange of these consonants is the case.
\textsuperscript{10} Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic, 163, 7. 1. 1).
\textsuperscript{11} Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 74-5.
\textsuperscript{12} Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 52-3, 64
\textsuperscript{13} Ja, Vol 1, 39 cites no plural for יָתַּלְתָּ.
\textsuperscript{14} Ja, Vol 1, 41.
A composite solution would allow that Aramaic סלולה חוות ארבע gave rise to the
Hebrew translation תעהנה חוות ארבע ( = MT ), which, when Aleph was the final
letter of the verb, gave rise to the corruption תעהנה אחרות ארבע ( = OG ).
There is no sure evidence here for an Aramaic original text.

Before analysing the textual evidence for this short clause, it is worthwhile exploring
the disagreement between Zimmermann and Ginsberg. Zimmermann maintained that
the Aramaic root י"ד could be the basis for Hebrew נצלך and Greek καθαρισθείσαται, but Ginsberg saw the problem as confusion between two roots,
יד and ות, which had different meanings.16

Zimmermann claimed that יד had the semantic range ‘justify, cleanse, purify’ and was
behind the apparently divergent meanings of the Hebrew ‘shall be justified’ and the
Greek ‘shall be cleansed’. However, he admitted there could have been confusion
between יד and ות, which carries only the meanings ‘purify, cleanse’. Zimmermann
relied for his evidence upon Ja which indicated that the two Aramaic roots overlapped
in semantic range:

**Peal**
‘be clear, pure, go unpunished, do good, obtain a claim on divine
favour’

---

15 Geissen, *Papyrus 967*, 129.
Pael  ‘clear, acquit, justify, leave unpunished, cleanse, defeat’

Ithpael  ‘be cleared, go unpunished’

דָּלי  ‘clear, be cleansed (from sin), be purified, be cleared away, removed, gone’

Based on the lexicography of Jastrow, the Peal of דָּלי has a better semantic range for Zimmermann’s purpose, able to cover both the idea of being justified, or acquitted, and of being cleansed with reference to Levitical cleanness, which is so apt for the context. On the other hand דָּלי in the Pael stem has a range of meanings which includes both ‘justify’ and ‘cleanse’, and the root is a standard equivalent for Hebrew בּוּרָן.

Sokoloff indicates a clearer divergence in meaning between the two roots, דָּלי carrying the idea of ritual purification and דָּלי that of merit or justification, supporting Ginsberg’s view; but most lexicons are not clear whether, in their primitive development, these were two separate roots at all. The evidence in the Targums also seems to support Ginsberg’s view that there was a difference in use between these two roots: דָּלי was most often used for the Hebrew בּוּרָן and at least once of שְׁדֵר. 

17 All Aramaic equivalents to Hebrew are as collated so far in:
A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets, Leiden et al, E J Brill:
Vol I, Joshua, (ed.) J C de Moor, 1995;
Vol II, Judges, (ed.) W F Smelik, 1996;
Vols III-V, Samuel, (ed.) E van Staaldhuine-Sulman, 1996;
Vols VI-VIII, Kings, (ed.) B Grossfeld, 1997;
Vols XII-XIV, Jeremiah, (ed.) F Sepmeijer, 1998;

18 This occurs in 2 Sam 11:4 where the Ithpa'el is used for Hebrew Hitpa'el. QA has the adjective בּוּרָן for ‘clean’ in 4Q196 (4QTob'ar) 6a; DSSSE Vol 1, 384. בּוּרָן is restored in 4Q156 (4QtgLev) 2; DSSSE Vol 1, 302-303.
Richard A Taylor finds a similar semantic difficulty with the Peshitta’s verb ק_above and suggests it might be an inner Syriac error for ק_above, which he thinks more appropriate in this context. It is more probable that the Peshitta was following closely the MT choice of verb, and was uninfluenced by the Greek, which indeed gives a better sense as Zimmermann has argued. Taylor’s difficulty here illustrates Zimmermann’s point, but his suggestion of graphic error gives more support to Ginsberg’s case, and the point is neatly illustrated by the differing roots employed by the Peshitta and the Syro-Hexapla.

It seems reasonable to conclude that the meanings of MT and OG could be derived from the one Aramaic root, דני, or could very easily be traced to a graphic confusion between דני and רן. These explanations based on Aramaic must be weighed against an Hebraic solution.

Most commentators have been content to accept the meaning ‘the sanctuary will be justified’, most recently Collins, who gives the sense ‘is set right’. Since the reading of MT could qualify as lectio difficilior, this must be one alternative for understanding the text.

Although the usual supporters of MT, i.e. θ, S and V, agree with OG, we cannot be sure whether they were simply preferring the reading of OG, or each had an alternative reading to MT in their respective Hebrew manuscripts. The former is the most likely, and these witnesses probably indicate that the sense of MT was not easily understood by the ancient translators.

---

19 Taylor, The Peshitta, 212, 224. He makes no reference to works of Zimmermann or Ginsberg, but he acknowledges the influence of A A Di Lella in his preface, p ix.
20 Collins, Daniel, 326.
21 Jeanson, The Old Greek, 60, says that θ was probably following OG because καθαριζεῖν was the normal semantic equivalent for παραδείγμα in the Greek Bible. McLay, The OG and Th, 166, notes, in the two similar texts, 8:11-14 and 9: 24-27, θ follows OG closely only here; but he lists καθαρισθεῖν as a feature where the dependence of OG and θ are unclear, p 248.
Jeansonne suggests that the Hebrew root פֶּרֶשׁ in MT is a graphic confusion for בֵּרֶשׁ because of OG’s employment of καθαρίσατα for בֵּרֶשׁ in 11:35. She points out that this Greek verb is a better equivalent for בֵּרֶשׁ than for פֶּרֶשׁ, and it is used for the sense ‘be pure’ in a number of contexts.22 This idea holds some attraction because it is based on a precedent in the OG and because the shape of the two words פֶּרֶשׁ and בֵּרֶשׁ are similar and might easily be confused by a copyist. The mistaking of Dalet for Resh needs no defense, though that of Qoph for Pe is more difficult. It would be more easy to imagine Qoph, with its right hand hook defective, being read as Pe, than that Pe acquired the right hand, hooked, horizontal stroke needed to appear like Qoph. However, if it is assumed that a copyist mistook the overall shape of the word without paying attention to each letter, this detail could be discounted.

A more serious misgiving concerning Jeansonne’s solution must be doubt whether בֵּרֶשׁ is an appropriate verb when used for the purification of a building, in this case, a sanctuary. It seems highly appropriate when used metaphorically of people purified by difficulties, as it is in 11:35; 12:10, since the implied analogy is to metals purified by the application of heat, from the basic meaning ‘refine’. The metaphorical use carries with it the idea of testing or proving of character through trials, and this hardly seems to fit the concept of restoring a sanctuary to ceremonial purity.

BH roots used for ritual purification of people and objects are רָשַׁם and קָשָׁם, of which the former is most common. רָשַׁם is used for purification of an altar in Lev 16:19, 30 and, most importantly for this context, in LBH of the temple in 2 Chr 29:15-18 (along with the root שֵׁלֶשׁ). Jeansonne herself points out that καθαρίζειν is used some seventy times in the Greek Bible for the root רָשַׁם and, from the OG reading here and the similar context in Chronicles, this is the verb that would have

22 Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 60. This text-critical suggestion is presented by Jeansonne as a rebuttal of the view that OG exhibits theological Tendenz, and, of course, any Aramaic textual solution would serve the same function.
made sense in Dan 8:14, assuming that restoration of the temple to ritual purity is being described.

It is important to note that in Daniel καθαρίζεται is only employed for unique Hebrew equivalents, or where there is none at all: it is used here for קדש, in 11:35 for both קדש and לֵּבַן.23 If an answer is sought in common equivalence, then Aramaic דכני provides it rather than Hebrew קדש. So the choice so far available for understanding קדש is between the following:

1) a unique expression in MT, taking the Niphal of קדש to mean ‘will be set right’ and the OG rendering of this verb to be interpretive;

2) amendment of MT to קדש on the basis of the OG reading and its equivalent in 11:35, which corresponds to Hebrew root קדש, understanding this to mean in 8:14 ‘will be purified’;

3) an error in the MT reading based on misreading of an Aramaic verb אָנַּח for דכני, or an error in understanding one of these verbs. Of these two Aramaic roots, אָנַּח is standard equivalent for Hebrew דכני, the root which suits the context best.

Solution 3) is the most satisfactory of these because mechanically it entails no confusion of consonants at all, or at most that of ת and ל. It also relies on common equivalence, unlike the Hebrew solutions which rely on the rare, even inappropriate meanings of verbs.

23 For these Hebrew roots, θ employs πυρωσα and ἀποκαλυπτεῖν respectively, and 11:35 has its own textual problems.
Zimmermann did not explain in detail what process he thought resulted in an Aramaic text giving rise to the different readings in MT and OG in 8:14. Theoretically there are several possibilities.

A. Writers of MT and OG could have been translating from Aramaic manuscripts:
   i) these may already have developed into different recensions in Aramaic because of one of the errors described in 3) above, or
   ii) an error could have been made by the Hebrew translator.

B. There may have been two different Hebrew translations from Aramaic manuscripts. MT would represent a recension in which an error developed in the Hebrew text, and OG would be a translation from a second, accurate Hebrew recension. The latter would have had a reading נ下面小编, or a synonym, instead of נלארק.

However, solution 3) allowed the possibility of a semantic error in an underlying Aramaic text, and it has already been shown that where Zimmermann detected an error in understanding original Aramaic text, it is more likely that the Hebrew of MT is a calque of a meaning in Aramaic. It is possible that Hebrew נלארק is a calque of a passive verb in Aramaic, the Ithpeal of ידכ (where the Pael can mean ‘justify’ or ‘cleanse’, and the root is the common equivalent for ידכ ), or of the Ithpael of ידכ (where the Peal can mean be ‘clean’ or be ‘acquitted’ ). Of course, such a calque could simply represent the method by which the MT recension arose in A or B above; but it is also possible that the OG translator had נלארק in a Hebrew manuscript and recognised the calque, understanding the intended meaning. Since LXX occasionally evidences an Aramaic meaning understood in a Hebrew term,24 it is conceivable that the translator into Greek would be capable of detecting a calque of Aramaic in Hebrew, though not necessarily every one which occurred would be recognised.

---

24 Tov, The Text-critical use, 109-110. A Bludau, Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältnis zum massorethischen Text (1897, Freiburg, Herder’sche Verlagshandlung), 142, and Montgomery, A Critical, 36, concluded that the vernacular of the OG translator was Aramaic and not Hebrew.
Therefore two more possibilities must be added to A and B.

C. There may have been one Hebrew translation from an original Aramaic, represented by MT, involving a calque, and OG is a translation from MT where either:

i) the calque was one in general use and was therefore understood by the Greek translator or

ii) the Greek translator was aware that his Hebrew text was a translation from Aramaic and therefore recognised the calque as an error which he corrected in his own work.

D. MT is an original work in Hebrew which utilised the suggested calque in 8:14. The translator into the Greek of OG had the same reading as MT in a Hebrew manuscript and recognised the calque, being aware that it was Aramaising Hebrew in the Vorlage.

It can be seen from alternative D that it is possible to trace an Aramaic source for readings in MT and OG which seem to diverge in meaning, of which we have an example in the respective readings πρέπει and καθαρισθησέται, but this cannot be taken as absolute proof of an Aramaic Vorlage. For it may be no more than another example of how semantic interference cannot be relied upon as a sign of translation from an Aramaic manuscript.
Zimmermann rejected the sense ‘riddles’ for תודריה, and he suggested that behind this Hebrew was Aramaic נדד, misread as plural absolute of סכנת, ‘riddle’, when it was in fact singular absolute of סכנת, meaning ‘power’. He further added that the full phrase in Aramaic was probably רמא למשתכל, ‘crafty in power’, a more suitable adjunct to בּוֹן פַּנָּיו. 25

All the Versions appear to support the reading תודריה, though it is notable that Zimmermann’s Aramaic retroversion is the same as the Peshitta’s נדד, which is ambiguous in the same way his suggested Aramaic text could have been. There is nothing here to indicate that any of the Versions had a different text to MT, except that OG and Syh lack a conjunction.

תודריה usually means ‘riddle’ or ‘obscure saying’, though in Hab 2:6 it appears to mean ‘mocking poem’. Where the lexicons supply a more suitable meaning here in Daniel, they are only relying on the context. So KB3 suggests ‘ambiguous saying’, and Cl, ‘problem’. 26 Commentators, from at least as far back as Bevan up to the present, accept the idea of ‘double-dealing’, 27 so that, as Bevan observed, תודריה carries little difference in meaning from עֲנָיִית הָלַכְלֵיָה in 11:21, 34. Montgomery also

25 Cf page 78.
26 KB3, Vol 1, 309; Cl, Vol 3, 204.
27 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 139; Collins, Daniel, 339-40, translates ‘adept in duplicity’.
develops this sense with reference to Antiochus’ diplomatic skills and ‘Machiavellian arts’. These all, in one way or another, show agreement with Zimmermann that ‘riddles’, or some similar concept of wisdom saying, is unsuitable for the context, but they assume that the Hebrew can, when applied to a ruthless monarch, describe political machinations. They arrive at their suggested meanings without recourse to Aramaic and without supplying other precedents in Hebrew.

The only other place where תִּדְרַדְרַדְו 퐀 is used with the verb בִּין is in Prov 1:6, where it is listed as one of many wisdom genres. בִּין is not used with הָבָס as object in MT nor with any of its synonyms. Extra-biblical evidence for Zimmermann’s preferred sense of ‘power’ is use of הָבָס with הָבָס in 1Q34:97.14 which reads וַאֲבַעַס בִּין מַכָּתוּר, but the context here is (lack of) appreciation of divine power, and the construction includes the preposition ב.

The Peshitta, since it is a translation of Hebrew, cannot be taken as proof of an Aramaic idiom, but it illustrates what a possible Aramaic Vorlage might have been.

If there is no external material which might corroborate the use of תִּדְרַדְרַדְו in a political context or the use of an idiom in either Hebrew or Aramaic which might mean ‘crafty in power’, then part of the answer may be that the Hiphil of Hebrew root בִּין is a calque of Aramaic שלך in the Ithpeal. שלך could then mean ‘looking at, paying attention to, considering, having regard for’. On the basis of the Qumran text, the phrase could mean ‘appreciating power’, i.e. in modern idiom, ‘understanding (only) the language of force’.

---


29 For 1Q34:3.2,(1Q Lit Pr bis:3.2,) see D Barthélemy & J T Milik, DJD I, 1955, 154; see also *DSSSE*, Vol 1, 144. The same construction is restored in 4Q509:97.14 (4Q Pr Fêtes 97.1); cf M Baillet, DJD VII *Qumran Grotte 4, III*, (4Q482 - 4Q520), 199; *DSSSE*, Vol 2, 1026-7.

30 Cf KB3, Vol 5, 1987; 2Q, Vol 2, 990-1; Sokoloff, 377, for this range of meaning in the Ithpeal / Hithpael of Aramaic שלך / שלך.
To summarise, there is no evidence external to this verse that has been found in this study to support the translation commonly adopted by scholars for this clause, so that the sense ‘double-dealing’ must be judged as a rare meaning of the Hebrew noun תַּחְרִיָּה. Zimmermann’s conjecture offers a rational explanation as to how the translation ‘crafty in power’ may be arrived at from a consonantal homograph in an Aramaic Vorlage.

9:26

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{MT} & \quad \text{יִשְׂרָאֵל} \quad \text{רֶמֶשׁ} \quad \text{שֵׁשֶׁה} \quad \text{עָשַׂה} \quad \text{נִצָּר} \quad \text{כְּנֶגֶד} \quad \text{הָגָה} \quad \text{כְּשֶׁנֶּה} \\
\text{S} & \quad \text{sŏvwo} \quad \text{eden} \quad \text{sal} \quad \text{uz} \quad \text{levad} \quad \text{kekstai} \quad \text{sephw} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{et} \quad \text{civitatem} \quad \text{et} \quad \text{sauantuarium} \quad \text{disipabit} \quad \text{populus} \quad \text{cum} \quad \text{duce} \quad \text{venturo} \quad \text{et} \quad \text{finis} \quad \text{eius} \quad \text{vastitas} \\
\theta & \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{tyn} \quad \text{polin} \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ayion} \quad \text{diaftherei} \quad \text{sun} \quad \text{tov} \quad \text{ηγουμενω} \quad \text{tov} \quad \text{ερχομενω} \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{εκκοπησονται} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{kataklysmw} \\
\alpha \text{Eus} & \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{tyn} \quad \text{polin} \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ayion} \quad \text{diaftherei} \quad \text{laos} \quad \text{ηγουμενου} \quad [\text{tov}] \quad \text{ερχομενου} \\
\alpha \text{88} & \quad \text{laos} \quad \text{ηγουμενου} \quad [\text{-voc mend. 88}] \quad [\text{tov}] \quad \text{ερχομενου} \\
\sigma & \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{η} \quad \text{προθεσμα} \quad \text{autou} \quad \text{en} \quad \text{epiklysmw} \\
\text{OG} & \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{basileia} \quad \text{ethnoun} \quad \text{fthereri} \quad \text{tyn} \quad \text{polin} \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ayion} \quad \text{meta} \quad \text{tou} \quad \text{christou}, \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{suntheleia} \quad \text{autou} \quad \text{met'} \quad \text{dragns} \\
\text{Syh} & \quad \text{καταστω} \quad \text{διυλια} \quad \text{οδυνασμα} \quad \text{διακαταστω} \quad \text{κρινων} \quad \text{καταστω} \quad \text{διακαταστω} \quad \text{κρινων} \quad \text{καταστω} \quad \text{διακαταστω} \quad \text{κρινων} \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \text{31 Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel 190-1; Eus dem 386 et ecl. III 46.} \]
\[ \text{32 Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 191; 88 anon Syh.} \]
Zimmermann argued that אָרְקָר was inappropriate, and he preferred to see behind it Aramaic הָרוּת, misread as ‘his end’ instead of ‘his sword’, metonymy for ‘his army’. His reasoning was weak here, because he was forced to resort to metonymy to explain what would otherwise be an unusual reading in any language. The problem of historical sequence in the context of vv 26-27 may be solved if a different antecedent from אֲבֹדֶה (when taken as referring to Antiochus IV) is understood for the pronominal suffix in רַע. This could be בֵּית, ‘the people (of the coming leader)’, or even שִׁירִּים, ‘the sanctuary’, the destruction of which is alluded to.

This section of text has a number of problems, and interpretation of the pronoun suffix in רַע depends on how it is understood. This is particularly the case because OG does not have the conjunction before הַסְוֵּתְלֵא but before הָאָט, suggesting that its Vorlage had Vav before אֲבֹדֶה and not רַע; but OG is substantially different from MT as a whole.

None of the Versions shows evidence of having read ‘his sword’, but there are some variants to be explained. א reads קָדָי אֶֽכֶּסַּתְּסַונָתָּא for אָרְקָר and has perhaps read רַע, Pual of יָעַר, ‘cut’. Jastrow cites only the Niphal for the passive mood, but a Pual participle occurs in Judg 1:7 in BH. V and א follow MT faithfully, except that א does not indicate definite status for בּוּנְשָׁא, and Syh follows OG. א illustrates the problem of the antecedent of the suffix by reading a feminine one which relates to אֲבֹדֶה, but otherwise supports MT.

Finally, OG reads ṭוּנֶשְׁא where MT has בּוּנְשָׁא. This may simply be interpreting the metaphor, where בּוּנְשָׁא is often used in contexts of divine judgment, but since this

33 Cf page 78.
34 McLay, The OG and Th, 201, note 28, queries this reading in א but has no explanation for it.
35 Judg 1:7 has the phrase שְׁבַעְשָׁא נָלַיְמָא הָאָבֹדֶה אֲבֹדֶה שְׁבַעְשָׁא.
Hebrew word can also take the form יָנַשׁ, and there is also the word יְנַשֶּׁה, which means ‘anger’, the translator may have had one of these variants in the Hebrew. It is not difficult to imagine the development from יִנַשֶּׁה to its variant יִנַשׁ and to קָנַשׁ under the influence of רֹאֵשׁ preceding. Isa 54:8 has the phrase יָנַשׁ, and it is even possible that this phrase was used in Daniel and קָנַשׁ was lost through homoioteleuton, resulting in the MT reading; or יָנַשׁ was lost in the OG Vorlage.

If these variant readings seem to have their source in Hebrew textual errors, there is still the difference between MT and OG in position of the conjunction to explain. Retroversions into Hebrew compared to MT, including the preceding verb, could be as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Heb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לֹא תַּעֲשָׂה בְּשָׁתָה</td>
<td>לֹא תַּעֲשָׂה בְּשָׁתָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ &gt; Heb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נָכַה כָּזַה כְּפַדַּה</td>
<td>נָכַה כָּזַה כְּפַדַּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG &gt; Heb</td>
<td>נָכַה כָּזַה כְּפַדַּה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &gt; Heb</td>
<td>נָכַה כָּזַה כְּפַדַּה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retroversions to Aramaic could be the following.

| MT > Aram | Aram יָנַשׁ בּשָׁתָה |
| S > Aram  | יָנַשׁ בּשָׁתָה |

S would retrovert to the same consonantal text in Aramaic as MT, but the confusion between feminine and masculine third singular pronominal suffixes must be counted as

37 See KB3, Vol 4, 1637-8.
38 An alternative solution, though less likely, is that there was a similar process involved with the phrase יִנַשׁ, which occurs in Prov 27:4.
an internal Syriac reading, unless it can be shown to be related to a reading of the preceding parts of the verse that could only be found in Aramaic.

As יָבַשׁ has no cognate form in Aramaic, there is not the same potential for explaining the different readings שָׁנַה and קָמָה in Aramaic as there is הָנָה and קָמָה in Hebrew, confirming that this is probably a variation in meaning that arose in Hebrew. The passive verb in 0 can be traced to רָצַר read as a Pual verb, without conjecturing a consonant change. The difference between MT אַפָּה and אֵפָי, retroverted from OG, may be a mechanical error in which the Dalet of the preceding word, תַּהְבָּה, was too close to the conjunction, so that a ligature of Dalet and Vav has been read as the definite article He. The opposite process is an alternative solution: a He may have been written carelessly so that it resembled a reduplication of Dalet followed by Vav, and then the apparent dittography may have been lost. The problem of the conjunction, which appears in MT וְאֵפָי but not in the equivalent of OG, is precisely the same in Hebrew and Aramaic, so this minor variant cannot be used to determine the language of the Vorlage.
Zimmermann did not like the sense ‘he shall strengthen the covenant’, and he thought the clause in original Aramaic read קיפע ידוהי, with Aphel imperfect בֹּלַל, meaning ‘he shall profane the covenant’, misread as בֹּלresse, Pael imperfect בֹּלִית, meaning ‘he shall strengthen the covenant’. He relied on the plene spelling of the imperfect of בֹּלַל, as used in targums.39

Superficially it is difficult to see what fault Zimmermann found in this clause, apart from his appeal to historical reality, since the concept of strengthening a covenant in some way does not seem an unreasonable meaning and, as he noted, the MT has support in all the Versions. However, it is a unique expression and Cl, like Zimmermann, rejects the meaning ‘strengthen’, citing this verse alone for the Hiphil of בֹּל with a meaning (like the Piel of the same) of ‘enforce’.40 Elsewhere the Hiphil means ‘grow strong’, being intransitive. KB3 queries the meaning of the verb here, noting the sense which most of the Versions have as ‘make a strong covenant’ with the alternative suggestion of ‘make difficult’, i.e. ‘break the covenant’, or ‘become

---

39 Cf page 79.
40 CI, Vol 2, 312, supplies the meaning ‘enforce’ for the Hiphil of בֹּל, citing only Dan 9:27.
difficult, pressing'. The latter suggestion reverses the meaning generally understood by the Hiphil of בָּרָא!! It presumably arises because of the historical referent of the covenant as religious and Jewish, but this interpretation is not universally accepted.

Among commentators, Bevan concluded that the meaning could not be determined here; Ewald translated `conclude a covenant', Montgomery, `make strong a covenant', and a number of scholars were dissatisfied enough with MT to emend the text. Charles preferred an Aramaic retroversion, which he translated `And a stringent statute shall be issued (against the many...)’, because he found the difficulty in the noun בחירה rather than the verb.

The only other use of בָּרָא in the Hiphil in MT with a similar sense is in Ps 12:5, where the context is different. There the reading is (with the antecedent `the boastful’) which is usually translated `who say `by our tongues we will prevail’’. There is also 1QH165, but here לְשׁון is the direct object of בָּרָא in the Hiphil. The synonymous צו is used in Piel form to govern the noun בחירה in MT and in 1 Qsb 323, which reads בחורה בן אל לְשׁון בחירה, which Milik translates que Dieu a choisis afin de renforcer son alliance.

41 KB3, Vol I, 175.
42 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 159.
43 Ewald, A Commentary, 276.
44 Montgomery, A Critical, 385.
45 Cf Montgomery, A Critical, 385-6, 389, and Charles, A Critical, 250, for some examples.
46 Charles, A Critical, 223, 249; Collins, Daniel, 357, note 101 for Akkadian and Aramaic links.
47 DSSSE, Vol 1, 182; CI, Vol 2, 312 erroneously gives the reference as 1QH165. According to CI the Piel stem of בָּרָא, meaning `make mighty’, is used with object יָכָה in Ps 103:11, but this refers to an emendation of a Qal verb in MT; see KB3, Vol 1, 175. CI also lists a Piel form in 4QShiShab 1.10 (4Q400 1.18) with יָכָה as object, but it seems more likely that לְבָרָא is intransitive, the subject being the priests referred to in the passage; cf DJD Vol XI, 176; DSSSE Vol 2, 808-9.
48 See Barthélemy & Milik, DJD Vol I, 1955, 124; DSSSE Vol 1, 106. CI Vol 1, 187 also lists 4Q Bark1 14 (4Q346 14 ?) for Piel of צו with בחירה and 1QH 14, (1QH14, ?) with צו but I have failed to find the examples at these references. For the Hiphil of צו with בחירה CI cites 4QD 31 (4Q267 31 ?) but this is apparently a restored text - again I have been unable to trace it.
Another issue is the meaning of the preposition ב when used in conjunction with the Hiphil of בֶּרֶךְ: Cl cites its use in Ps 12:5 as the sign of the instrument, whereas here in Daniel it is ב of ‘benefit for’.

It has been noted that the Versions support MT, but OG differs from the others in that it has taken תִּרְצוּ as the subject of the verb rather than the direct object, and Syh follows this reading. OG in fact has a double reading⁴⁹ in a much longer text which creates considerable difficulties for the reader in a group of verses which are replete with textual problems. However both OG readings of this clause, δύναστευσαί ἢ διαθηκὴ and ἐν τῷ κατισχυσαι τὴν διαθηκὴν, have διαθηκὴ as the subject of the verb⁵⁰ and these are not variant readings but different understandings of the same text as MT. So the Hebrew reading can be understood as ‘he shall make strong a covenant ...’ or ‘a covenant will be strong’.

The Aramaic root בֶּרֶךְ in the Aphel stem means to ‘make strong’; it occurs in Targ Isa 41:25, which reads קָנְבֵּךְ בְּשֶׁמֶךָ, and the question arises whether the Hiphil of בֶּרֶךְ here in Dan 9:27 is a calque of the Aphel in Aramaic. However there is no conclusive evidence in this clause that would suggest an underlying written Aramaic text.

⁴⁹ Ziegler, Susanna Daniel, 191, parenthesised the first of the two OG readings, but it is not precisely the same as the θ reading and there seems no way of choosing which of the two is ‘ο’.
⁵⁰ The second, subordinate clause employing the accusative and infinitive appears to be a temporal clause referring back to the first one, hence it follows the same syntax as the first with regard to subject of the verb; however the use of two different verbs, δύναστευσαί and κατισχυσαί, is suggestive of conflation of variants or perhaps a later addition to the text. See Jeansonne, The
Whilst Ginsberg and Hartman were content to adopt the emendment διαίτητον for MT ἡ ἱλαρόν, Zimmermann preferred the retroversion of MT ἡ ἱλαρόν to Aramaic חָֽבָּר לְעַל, 'on the wing'. The translator, he suggested, read חָֽבָּר לְעַל, 'and upon the wing', when the author intended חָֽבָּר לְעַל, 'there shall come the blasphemy of', from the verb לְעַל and the noun חָֽבָּר, 'blasphemy'. Although this is a neat account of the unusual reading, it suggests a doubling of terms for what is shocking, ‘blasphemy’ in a genitive relationship with

---

51 Here P967 reads καὶ περιγυρίζον αφανίσιον ἐφος συντελειας καὶ σπουδῆς ταξιν αφανίσιον.
52 Ginsberg, Studies, 80, note 15b; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 240, note 1-1. The popular emendation, חָֽבָּר for חָֽבָּר, as Dr T H Lim has pointed out (seminar, New College, Edinburgh, Feb. 2001), is based on a plausible error of final Pe for Vav, but a suitable singular antecedent to the suffix is lacking. It must be taken as חָֽבָּר חָֽבָּר conceived as one entity, or a singular term understood, e.g. דִּין בְּרֶיה; cf Bevan, A Short Commentary, 160; Charles, A Critical, 223. This is

---

Old Greek, 129-130; Mclay, The OG and Th, 44, note 12.
‘abomination’. There is no precedence for this in MT and neither is there a variant reading to support it. Yet Zimmermann did at least find a way of accounting for the lack of a verb in MT. The loss of Yod between a conjunctive Vav on one side and Ayin on the other was an easy error to make. However, this could have occurred in Hebrew, especially if a jussive was employed as elsewhere in Hebrew Daniel; see 11:7, 15-19, 25, 28, 30, 45.

The Versions highlight variations in number in the two substantives בְּנֵי וָדִיק and שָׂפָרִים, but these are easily accounted for in terms of Hebrew errors. The Peshitta’s plural / dual form סֶהכָּה is equivalent to a plural /dual construct כְּנֶפֶשׂ in Hebrew: it may indicate that this was the Hebrew reading and a Yod had fallen out, or the translator may have preferred the more usual form for ‘wings’ for a smooth reading. Most of the Versions have a singular substantive like MT, and in support of this can be cited Job 39:13, ‘wing of ostriches’, but the dual is the more frequent usage.

Symmachus has the only reading which agrees with MT plural שָׂפָרִים, the other Versions agreeing with the singulars in 11:31; 12:11. The variants can easily be explained as either haplography or dittography of Mem in forms without matres lectionis. OG, followed by Theodotion and the Syro-hexapla, has a plural equivalent for מְשָׁנֵמ, which again can easily be traced to confusion over the number of Mems in a Hebrew text.

The difficulties in interpreting this section of 9:27 and the solutions that have been found are well-known.53 It seems best to begin an analysis of MT by starting with כְּנֶף. Unable to make sense of it in this context, many scholars have found it necessary to emend it,54 but there is a perfectly reasonable use of כְּנֶף to be found in

---

53 These are well covered by Montgomery, A Critical, 387-9 and Collins, Daniel, 357-8.
54 Thus Collins, Daniel, 346 note 69; Hartman & Di lella, Daniel, 240 note I-I: see Montgomery, A Critical, 386-90, for earlier suggestions.
MT in the major prophetic texts. There it refers to armies of invading foreigners in battle array, as part of the metaphor of the bird of prey spreading its wings over its intended victim. This is most fully developed in Jer 48:40 and 49:22, where it depicts aggressors against Moab and Bozrah in Edom. The metaphor is linked in Isa 8:8 with that of a flood, which is another image employed in Daniel, and the expression אלים המים in Isa 18:1 could mean, according to CI, ‘clashing armies’. In all these references the Targums render HPDID by KJTHU773, ‘camps, troops’, underlining the military context of the usage. The parable of the two eagles in Ezek 17:3, 7, represents Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon and the king of Egypt, where their description as ודלי כדפקים alludes to their great military power.

Moreover this sense for הכנה may be supported by two versions, Symmachus (and Aquila according to the Syro-Hexapla) and a variant of Theodotion. The σ reading τὸν ἄρχην can mean ‘a body of troops’, which is a LXX usage in Judg 7:16; 9:34; 1 Re (MT 1 Sam) 11:11; 13:17, 18; 1 Macc 5:33. Here ἄρχη translates Hebrew ושאר, which is used of a division of an army. In these references Targum Jonathan

---

55 See use of פכנית in Dan 9:26; 11:10, 22, 26, 40.
56 CI, Vol 1, 387; contra CI, Vol 4, 439, ‘buzzing of (insect) wings’. KB3, Vol 2, 486; Vol 3, 1031, have ‘rustling of wings’, ‘the winged cricket’, or ‘sailing ships’.
57 The metaphor of the vulture/eagle for the enemy is of course used for its speed and predatory nature as in Jer 4:13; Lam 4:19; Deut 28:49.
58 The imagery of the eagle is used in Dan 4:30 for Nebuchadnezzar’s condition in exile from court, but this is not a military context and so its use is ironic. See also 7:4.
59 Montgomery, A Critical, 390, connects the σ reading τὸν ἄρχην which is translated in Isa 19:15, in LXX and σ, by ἄρχην, where ἄρχην καὶ τελος translates MT בֶן הָיוֹן: see also J Ziegler, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Vol XIV, Isaías (1939, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 190. However, where the same expression occurs in MT Isa 9:13, LXX reads, μεγαν καὶ μικρον, and σ has καμπιοντα καὶ κημιοντα according to Ziegler. The metaphorical ים in MT Isa 19:15 is parallel to שֹׁם and both represent the rulers who will be ‘cut off’ along with the ordinary citizen. Whilst Montgomery’s is not an improbable connection (because reference to a ruler would not be out of place in Dan 9:27), it is less well attested in LXX than הבן – ἄρχην, and it imports a different metaphor, the ‘branch’, which does not accord well with שָׁמִיש.
60 See LS, Vol 1, 252; E A Sophocles, A Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (2nd edn, 1887, New York, Charles Scribner’s Sons), 256. This usage is not found in classical literature but is a Hebraism because ἄρχη is rendering שלמה in the Biblical references.
again employs יְכִינוֹן where MT has יִשְׂרָאֵל and LXX has ἱρέα. In the Qumran War Scroll both יִשְׂרָאֵל and יִשְׂרָאֵל are used in a detailed list of military forces, denoting different divisions of troops, and it is notable that יְכִינוֹן is singular there as in Daniel.

The variant of Theodotion in Clement has alternative readings πετρυγιον αφανισμον and ταξιν αφανισμον, in each case the equivalent of חֲנִנָּה, indicating differing translations of חֲנִנָּה. πετρυγιον means ‘wing, end, projection’, but ταξιν agrees with the θ text since ταξις denotes ‘battle array’ of an army or a ‘rank, line’ of soldiers. All this supports the view that חֲנִנָּה in MT can mean ‘troops’. There are of course many variants to be reckoned with in both ΩG and θ texts of this verse. Montgomery’s analysis of the variants in θ did not include the above text of Clement, but he does use the Lucianic variant.

That the figure of the bird of prey is the key to understanding this text is supported by two aspects of MT. The eagle or gryphon vulture, רָשָׁב, was among the category of creatures defined as יָרֵפִשׁ in Lev 11:13. In Jewish literature this was a fitting image for the foreign invader, especially a king, as in Ezekiel. So the expression with a plural, ‘wing of abominations’, could be a reference to foreign soldiers whose invasion would be so repulsive to the Jews. A singular יָרֵפִשׁ could be a direct reference to the Greek king.

61 Cf IQM 91
63 Montgomery, A Critical, 402-4; Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 191; cf Migne, ibid. and note (56), where it is recorded the margin of B has, amongst others, the variant και σπονδῆς ταξις ἐκπ αφανισμον. Here σπονδῆς appears to be an error for, and alternative to, σπονδή, unless the idea of speed is in some way read into the verb ἔρχεται. According to Montgomery, A Critical, 390, ταξις, ‘will be appointed, commanded’, is an error for σταξει of σ (α), presumably because ἔρχεται is not future tense.
64 The original term without mater lectionis could have been יָרֵפִשׁ, but the use of יָרֵפִשׁ makes no difference to the argument above since it is a synonym: perhaps the use of the intensive form indicates the degree of repulsion felt by the writer.
Secondly, the word which otherwise must be understood as a preposition, דָּבָר, could be read as דָּבָר ‘prey, booty’.\(^{65}\) If הַכִּלֵל is read as a verb the sense of the following clause is ‘a prey has been consumed’: there is a problem with the tense, though it is no large emendation to suggest that a Yod may have been lost from an imperfect form הַכִּלֵל. This solves the problem of the lack of verb in the MT, and if Zimmermann’s example is followed, and הָעַל is assumed to represent a verb, then the text could have had the meaning: ‘and an army of abominations that desolates will arise ( ascend? הָעַל or הָעַל, jussive ), and a prey will be consumed / destroyed but what is decreed will be poured out upon the desolator ( the desolate )’.\(^{66}\)

This is still not a very smooth text and perhaps a better one would result from adopting the singular יִשְׁנֶה which was read by most of the Versions and found in the Hebrew of 11:31; 12:11. The majority of the quotations of this expression, in 1 Macc 1:54 and the Synoptic Gospels, also witness to the singular term of the OG and \(\Theta\). However, in the Gospel parallels, where Mk 13:14 and Mt 24:15 seem to follow the Greek text, the Lukan account in 21:20 has ‘when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies’\(^{67}\). This may support the interpretation of הַכִּלֵל as ‘army’, and it may indicate a plural as found in the Peshitta.

---

\(^{65}\) KB3, Vol 2, 786; BDB, 723; the best example of this sense for דָּבָר is in Gen 49:27.

\(^{66}\) When the verbal suffix was lost in Aramaic, what remained, along with the conjunction and participle following, would have suggested the phrase well-known from Isaiah to the translator לְּכִלֵל הָעַל.

\(^{67}\) The full NT texts are: Mark 13:14

'Adding to the destruction of the abominations, the city is going to be left desolate ( i.e. destroyed ) by different armies, and a prey will be consumed / destroyed but what is decreed will be poured out upon the desolator ( the desolate ).'

Matthew 24:15-16a

'Adding to the destruction of the abominations, the city is going to be left desolate ( i.e. destroyed ) by different armies, and a prey will be consumed / destroyed but what is decreed will be poured out upon the desolator ( the desolate ).'

Luke 21:20-21a

'Adding to the destruction of the abominations, the city is going to be left desolate ( i.e. destroyed ) by different armies, and a prey will be consumed / destroyed but what is decreed will be poured out upon the desolator ( the desolate ).'

The imagery of the eagle as foreign invader, specifically the king, is particularly apt for the Roman army with its legionary standard of eagle wings, and for Titus’ entry into the Temple.
The quest for a smooth text in this verse is further hampered by the problematic use of the participles שְׂמֹמֶנָה, שְׁカーָּו ו שְׂמֹמֶנָה. They cannot be examined without reference to 11:31, השקור ו שְׁמֹמֶנָה, and 12:11, השקור ו שְׁמֹמֶנָה. The root שְׁמֹמֶנָה is usually intransitive in the Qal and Niphal and transitive in the Hiphil stem. The participles in Daniel appear to be transitive but the form without Mem would normally be read as Qal and the forms with Mem lack Yod to indicate Hiphils. The lexicons therefore usually list them as shortened Polel participles or transitive Qal, both of which are unattested elsewhere.68

These participles may be better understood as calques of the standard equivalent in Aramaic, the root קָר שְׁקָרָּו of which most of the stems, Peal (possibly), Pael and Aphel are transitive.69 It is a particularly attractive solution in 9:27 because the homonym of this root in Aramaic, קָר שְׁקָרָּו in Ja, means ‘hunt, catch’ and this would continue the metaphor of the bird of prey. A word play may have existed between the idea of causing destruction and hunting, but this could only have occurred in an Aramaic text. Such a pun would have been understood in all the contexts in Daniel where the Aramaic equivalent of שְׁカーָּו and שְׂמֹמֶנָה occurred along with יִשְׁלָם. The pun would not be translatable into Hebrew or Greek.

Retroverting MT to Aramaic, it is therefore possible that it read: קָר שְׁカーָּו שְׁמֹמֶנָה: ‘and there will come (a wing/ army) of a predatory abomination and a prey will be consumed’. It can be seen that, with the Aramaic term for ‘spoil’, כָּר יִשְׁלָם,70 the Yod (which is not in the cognate Hebrew term), may have caused the loss of preformative Yod in the imperfect which followed.

---

68 See BDB, 1030-1; KB3, Vol 4, 1564-5.
69 Ja, Vol 2, 1262. The Peal seems to be intransitive, although Jastrow listed its meaning as ‘to desolate’. Its usage appears to be mainly in the form of the passive participle and BCTP Vols XII – XVII includes finite Peal verbs which mean ‘be desolate’, but none with a transitive sense.
70 Ja, Vol 2, 1044.
There remains the problem of the OG variant το ιερον for MT קַכָּה. The long-standing solution, linked with the variant of θ which reads πτερογιον, would understand MT to mean ‘and upon a pinnacle there will be an abomination which desolates’ where a singular שֶׁכֶר must be read to accord with משכון. The Greek translator took the ‘pinnacle’ to be that of the Temple: the Herodian building had this feature, cf Mt 4:5; Lk 4:9, and there was probably something like it on the second temple.71 Reference is also made to 1 Macc 1:54 where a similar Greek expression βελτυμα ἐρημοσευζ (cf 11:31 in OG, θ) is referred to upon the altar.72 This understanding requires that historically some idol, such as that of Zeus Olympios, was erected upon a high point of the temple (as well as upon the altar), though there is no account of this cited from ancient literature.

To suggest a reading meaning ‘pinnacle of the temple’ existed in original Hebrew is difficult, because no variant exists with this precise meaning. Neither is it easy to say how a Hebrew term such as שֶׁכֶר, קַכָּה or בְּתַי הָרָךְ, מָקָרָה could have been lost mechanically from the phrase נַלָי קַכָּה שֶׁכֶר. The most promising solution might be קַכָּה שֶׁכֶר lost before the Shin and Qoph of שֶׁכֶר, but this would include metathesis, and the loss of Dalet as well.73 It is easier to assume that OG το ιερον represents some understanding of קַכָּה, ‘wing, extremity’, as Montgomery suggests.74

Is there any Semitic term which could have caused the Greek translator to have understand a reference to the Temple of Jerusalem?

71 See Montgomery, A Critical, 387. He traced the linkage to Mt 4:5 back to Lapide.
72 Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 17.
73 Montgomery, A Critical, 390, dispensed convincingly with a late Hebrew variant in Kennicott which has דָּרְחֵל דְּרוֹזַר for קַכָּה.
74 Montgomery, A Critical, 386-7.
One such term has been explored already in the context of 11:31, the word הַחַל which could refer to the fortifications of the temple, and this word also means 'army'. However, if this were in an Aramaic Vorlage, it would not accord with the metaphor already traced in MT: it would require the Hebrew translator to have introduced the metaphor into the text in translating חַל by חָלֵל. Neither nor Zimmermann’s suggestion, חָלֵל, appear to have any potential for referring to the temple.

A feasible alternative is the word more commonly used for 'wing' in Aramaic, חָלֵל. Is there any way this word could be taken to refer to the Temple, apart from the possible description of an architectural feature as assumed for Hebrew חָלֵל? There is another usage which is attested in Hebrew and Aramaic.

The Hebrew substantive חָלֵל appears as a hapax legomenon in MT in Prov 9:3 in the phrase יָשָׁב עַל גֹּם הָמוֹרִים חָרָת, which seems to mean 'upon the highest places of the town'. J. lists the word as used, in Rabbincal literature, of the Roman Capitol, citing Sifré Numbers 115, Men 44 and Pes 87. The first two of these refer to a story of a Jewish man and a prostitute where the latter speaks an oath, 'by the Capitol of Rome', but the Jew replies 'by the Temple of Jerusalem! In fact Jewish translators display an uncertainty about the meaning of חָלֵל in this context which is suggestive of its possible misunderstanding in the context of Dan 9:27.

In Sifré Numbers 115 the woman’s expression is דָּגָר, which according to Ja refers to the Roman Capitol, but which Neusner gives as, 'By the winged god of Rome [Hillel]! The Jew replies with an oath, דָּגָר, which refers to ‘the

---

75 Cf page 144.
76 NJV translates ‘from the heights above the city’, and RSV, NIV, ‘from the highest point of the city’.
77 Ja, Vol 1, 262.
(Temple) Service. 79 In Menahot 44 a the woman says דנהר מצ רפס, where Jastrow would restore דנהר מצ רפס, Aramaic דנהר מצ רפס, and the man replies דנהר מצ רפס. The translations in the Soncino edition are ‘By the Roman Capitol’ and ‘By the Temple’ respectively. 80

A third example of the oath is found on the lips of a sectarian in Pesahim 87 b in the Aramaic form דנהר מצ רפס. Here the Soncino edition follows Jastrow and translates ‘By the Capitol of Rome!’ but an alternative is suggested as perhaps ‘By the Roman eagle!’ 81

The point is that the term דנהר appears to describe the highest point of a city, the citadel or Capitol, and these in both Rome and Jerusalem were the sites of significant temples. It is possible this was the original term which gave rise to OG translation το τερον. The Hebrew דנהר in MT could have been used as a calque of דנהר or it could be a mechanical error for the same: alternatively דנהר in an Aramaic Vorlage may have been translated variously into Hebrew as ‘wing’ or ‘temple’, for an abomination in the capitol would be the same as an abomination in the Temple which occupied the highest point in the city.

This solution dispenses with the necessity to conjecture a historical event in which some sacrilegious object was placed in the highest point of the Temple itself. The

Horowitz, p 128:16, attributes the story in Siphre Numbers to Rabbi Nathan and the same attribution is made in Menahem 44 a. Dr A P Hayman (in private communication) dates Rabbi Nathan as fourth generation Tanna, i.e. active about the second half of the second century C.E. If all these references are part of a similar floating tradition, they could be older than this, though this is not certain.

79 Ibid.
80 Ja, Vol 1, 262; מפסכת חכמים מם ת ------> לוב ; Epstein (ed), The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Kodashim (1948, London, Soncino), 265, where note (1) informs that Rashi rendered the former ‘By the head of Rome’ i.e. the emperor.
81 Ja, op cit; מפסכת חכמים מם ת ------> לוב ; Epstein (ed), The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Mo’ed (1938, London, Soncino), 464 and note (2).
general description in Greek Daniel of the site of the offence is rendered more precisely in 1 Macc 1 as being upon the altar.82

If this was the case, the reference to sacrilege in the Temple was only one way in which the original Aramaic was interpreted by a translator and this probably does not represent the intended meaning of the Vorlage, which seems to have referred to invasion and pillage. The original Aramaic may have been,

ירעלו ג' שִׁקּוֹן מַצְדָּא עַדָּי יִשְׁלָל

meaning, ‘and there will come a wing of an abomination that hunts and a prey will be consumed’, perhaps more smoothly ‘a wing of a predatory abomination...’. This was metaphor for, ‘there will come a division of foreign (i.e. pagan) troops that pillage / cause desolation and booty / people will be removed /annihilated’. The prey could be a metaphor for the spoils removed from Jerusalem, and by sacking of the Temple in particular, or it could refer to the people who were destroyed,83 since Jerusalem, the city, seems to have been characterised as a gazelle, i.e. a non-predatory animal attacked by others.84

There remains the possibility therefore that an original Aramaic text of v 27b described the coming of a foreign invader to Jerusalem, and that early errors in the transmission led to the present difficulties in MT and the variant of OG. Since this conclusion has been reached by way of a new understanding of the text, it cannot be used as decisive evidence for a written, Aramaic substratum. The link between

82 If interpretation of שִׁקּוֹן as the eagle representing the foreign king is carried through into 1 Macc 1:54, it suggests that what was built upon the altar was an idol, as Jerome indicated. The main altar was a large structure that could have accommodated an idol before which pagan sacrifices were offered, as in 2 Macc 6:5. The idol could have been Zeus Aetophorus; see e.g. M Pearlman, The Maccabees (1973, London / Jerusalem, Weidenfield & Nicolson), 9 facing, for such an image on a coin of Seleucus IV; but in my opinion it is more likely that Epiphanes erected an image of himself as Zeus. Cf J Zahle, ‘Religious Motifs on Seleucid Coins’ in P Bilde et al (eds), Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom (1990, Esbjerg, Aarhus UP), 126-8, 130, 134 and citation of Morkholm; also 136-7 figs. 8. Cf Zimmermann on Antiochus as Zeus, page 94.

83 The whole metaphor is no doubt an ancient one; cf Hos 6:1; and one which developed from the common practice of sacking the national sanctuary for its treasures upon invasion of any land, and of frequently destroying the building.
Aramaic נ and MT נ can stand independently of this new interpretation. However, since it is possible that calque was involved, i.e. MT נ was invested with the same semantic range as Aramaic נ by the OG translator, this also is not certain evidence of an Aramaic Vorlage.

To summarise, confusion in 9:27b may have been due to loss of two Yods in an Aramaic Vorlage.

a) The loss of Yod in ליעל led to its being read as a preposition governing נ, ‘wing, extremity, army division’, so that the copula had to be understood to make a nominal clause. This led to a transition in meaning from ‘wing, army division’ in MT, to ‘capitol, the Temple’ in OG.

b) Omission of Yod from ערי following עלי, led to loss of the imperfect tense: עלי was translated to Hebrew ח and was then read as a substantive and the Hebrew noun ע as a preposition. In conjunction with the participle which followed it was understood as a reference to a ‘determined end’.

84 This is only one way of interpreting Dan 8:9; cf pages 291-292.
Zimmermann dealt with two parts of this text. Firstly, he retroverted the difficult phrase "ла, שֶׁהָאָדָם יָשָׂר, the word) was very sure", and argued that was misunderstood as שֶׁהָאָדָם. Secondly, he said that the problematic form נִב derived from Aramaic שֶׁהָאָדָם שֶׁהָאָדָם where שֶׁהָאָדָם was a noun, misread as a verb, and Lamed a preposition mistaken for sign of the accusative.

In the first example, it is difficult to follow Zimmermann’s explanation for he seemed to be indicating that Hebrew noun שֶׁהָאָדָם was read in Aramaic instead of Aramaic שֶׁהָאָדָם. Of course, it is not impossible for a Hebrew word to be found in an Aramaic

85 Taylor, The Peshitta, 251, 259, 260, notes the Peshitta’s lack of conjunction where MT reads נִב, and the finite verb that translates שֶׁהָאָדָם, but he does not list the preposition in.
text: QA abounds in Hebraisms\textsuperscript{87} just as LBH has Aramaisms: so a translator would not necessarily be surprised to find a Hebrew word in an Aramaic text. The mechanical error would involve the loss of two Yods from \( \text{ךיהב} \), the first lost after a Vav and the second perhaps a failure to insert mater lectionis. Yet it is hard to accept a possible Hebrew word read in Aramaic as evidence of an \textit{Aramaic Vorlage}, especially a Hebrew word which did not make good sense in context!

There is no doubt that the phrase \( \text{ךיהב} \) is not easy to construe as it would usually mean ‘a great army / host’, but it stands in apposition to \( \text{דנור} \). Other interpretations have been the following.

1) The phrase means ‘and ( very ) hard service’ after the use of \( \text{ךיה} \) in Isa 40:2 and Job 7:1; 10:17; 14:14.\textsuperscript{88} This seems to equate \( \text{ךיה} \) with the prophetic \( \text{ךתנה} \), burden, without employing that term: normally \( \text{ךיה} \) is used of religious duties of the more mundane type; see e.g. Ex 38:8; Num 4:3, 30, 35, 39-43; 8:25.

2) The phrase means ‘much warfare’,\textsuperscript{89} though this hardly makes sense.

3) Rashi and Calvin, among other earlier scholars, arrived at the meaning ‘appointed time’.\textsuperscript{90}

A better explanation, from Aramaic, is that suggested by Dr A Peter Hayman,\textsuperscript{91} that \( \text{ךיה} \) is a calque of Aramaic \( \text{לכיה} \), the semantic range of which covers substantives ‘army, strength’ as well as adjectives ‘strong, powerful’. The same meanings may

\textsuperscript{86} Cf page 67.
\textsuperscript{87} Cf e.g. Fassberg, ‘Hebraisms’, 48-69, especially the section on nouns, 55-61.
\textsuperscript{88} In this vein Bevan, \textit{A Short Commentary}, 165; Montgomery, \textit{A Critical}, 404; Charles, \textit{A Critical}, 255; Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 361.
\textsuperscript{89} Hartman & Di Lella, \textit{Daniel}, 255; but Hartman considered the text corrupt, 262.
\textsuperscript{90} Cf Montgomery, \textit{A Critical}, 405.
have been wrongly attributed to Hebrew קִבְלָה, which only carries the sense ‘army’ from this range. The author intended the meaning, ‘the word was true and very powerful’. As frequently noted, a calque is not necessarily evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage, but this explanation yields a smoother text than any of those above.

Of the Versions, Theodotion and Jerome clearly had the same text as MT: the Θ text also used δυναμις for קִבְלָה in 8:10, 13: similarly the Vulgate has fortitudo in 8:10, 11, 13, though this is its standard equivalent for פָּנֶּה as well, in Daniel. The Peshitta included the preposition מ, probably an addition to smooth the difficult sense of MT. Each uses the appropriate standard equivalent for לֹדים.

The conflate nature of OG is demonstrated in the first clause καὶ ἀλήθεις τὸ ὄραμα καὶ τὸ προσταγμα for MT ἀλήθεια ἄδεια, which suggests that לֹидеֶּה may have been in the Vorlage as an alternative to ἀλήθεια. Jeansonne cites for comparison 4QDan⁴ in 8:1, where the reading נִלְלַעֲנָר [נ]בָּר is scored out and replaced with לֹיְדָה.⁹² Conflation is also possible with the phrase τὸ πληθὸς τῷ ἵσχυρον since ἵσχυρον is not a formal equivalent of לֹidenteֶּה. If a written Aramaic text lay behind OG, then these two Greek words would be alternative translations of the one word, לֹidenteֶּה. However, OG uses ἵσχυρος for לֹidenteֶּה in two other places in Daniel: in 10:7 it has φοβός ἵσχυρος for הַלְּכֵי הָיוֹן, and in 11:44 there is ἐν θυμῷ ἵσχυρος for הַלְּכֵי אֵלְקִין. It seems that ἵσχυρος is a dynamic equivalent of לֹidenteֶּה in these three references, but if so, it is characteristic only of OG of Daniel, for this is not the case elsewhere in LXX, nor in Θ of Daniel.⁹³

---

⁹¹ Private communication, 1996.
⁹² Cf Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 89; Ulrich, ‘Daniel’ Pt 1, 33.
⁹³ Θ reads in 10:7 ἐν ἐκστασις μεγαλη, and in 11:44 ἐν θυμῷ πολλαφ: see McLay, The OG and Th, 170 and note 33.
Another difference between MT and Theodotion on the one hand and OG and the Peshitta on the other is in the respective readings, דנויים, דועים, and פלאים, פלאים, where the latter terms are definite.

Another textual difficulty that has preoccupied scholars is the form of נב, infinitive, when a finite verb is required for the context. Most assume that a finite form has been lost⁹⁴ and in support of this, OG and α have a finite verb as if the Hebrew read נב instead of נב. Only a simple textual error is involved, the confusion of Vav and Yod. There is no decisive evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage in either expression cited by Zimmermann in this verse.

| 10:11, 19 | MT    | אֶלֶת הַדָּוְדָרָה |
|———|———|———|
|     | θ    | ἄνθρωπος ἐπιθυμοῦν |
|     | S    | כומס עֵשָׁב |
|     | V    | vir desideriorum |
| OG & 967 | ἄνθρωπος ἐλεείνος εἴ |
| Syh | אולק קשמא אשת |

Zimmermann maintained that the word הַדָּוְדָרָה was inappropriate in this context because in Hebrew it was normally only used of things and not people,⁹⁵ whereas in Aramaic it could be used of people. He retroverted the phrase to נב, נב, and found a threefold error in the Hebrew translation: הַדָּוְדָרָה should have been masculine and singular, and it should not have been a passive participle.⁹⁶

---

⁹⁴ Cf page 22, and Bevan, A Short Commentary, 165; Montgomery, A Critical, 405.
⁹⁵ Cf also Bevan, A Short Commentary, 152-3.
An initial response to Zimmermann’s view is that it is improbable three errors would occur in the translation of one word. This weakness in his argument, however, does not change the fact that יבשת הם תדרות is an unusual expression in MT, and that, along with OG יבשת הם תדרות, which is a variant reading, it needs to be explained.

The nine times יבשת הם תדרות occur in MT are Gen 27:15; Ezra 8:27; 2 Chr 20:25; Dan 9:23; 10:3, 11, 19; 11:38, 43. In addition many would amend Hab 2:7 תדרות to תדרות. Zimmermann was correct to assert that, except for Dan 9:23; 10:11, 19, this plural word describes things and not people.97 The root תדר mean ‘desire, take pleasure in’,98 usually in a bad sense; exceptional uses in a good sense are Ps 68:17, דלתא מרהה חפתו ודוהר_FOLDER Added and Isa 53:2, Even here the first is used of desire for an object, a mountain: though the expression in Isaiah involves desire for a person, the servant, it is concerned with attraction based on his appearance. With other substantives of the same root, תדרות, תדרות, the emphasis also seems to be on what is attractive to the senses, though some can be applied to humans: see Hos 9:16, מנהרי בני עם, ‘cherished offspring’; Ezek 23:6, פחית תסנינס בהרי חמד ‘governors and commanders ... handsome young men’ (NIV); cf vv12, 23.99 It may be that תדרות, like these words of the same root, can be used of persons and that Daniel provides the only examples of this usage. If so, there is still a question mark over the suitability of its semantic range for the context.


98 BDB 326.

99 תרי in Hag 2:7 was construed as Messianic by early Christian commentators, but whether amended to תרי, ‘desired things’, or not, can be taken as a reference to the spoils of war; cf P A Verhoef, The Books of Haggai & Malachi (New International Commentary on the Old Testament), 1987, Grand Rapids, Wm. B Eerdmans, 103-4. In Dan 11:37 the word is usually understood to refer to Tammuz, cf Ezek 8:14.
The passive form of דוד תמדורן leads to English translations ‘desirable, desirableness, precious, preciousness, attractive’,\(^\text{100}\) with the word construed as a substantive used adjectivally. The plural is described as intensive, being abstract and superlative\(^\text{101}\). However, the fact that the angel should refer to Daniel’s status on the basis of sensuous values seems inappropriate in the context, so that modern translators take the idea of ‘preciousness’ to indicate ‘beloved’ status\(^\text{102}\) or ‘highly esteemed’ ( NIV ). This nuance to the meaning is not impossible of course, and in the nominal clause of 9:23, דוד תמדורן הניח, it is the more necessary because ‘you are precious / attractive’ seems so out of place!

Of the three errors which Zimmermann detected here, clearly the intensive plural is a well known phenomenon in Hebrew and there seems no need of recourse to Aramaic to explain it: that the word functions as a substantive and not an adjective removes the necessity for agreement of gender: that it is a passive form is not a problem in Hebrew. Zimmermann only created the difficulty when, after retroverting it to Aramaic קיתן, he assumed it had been mistaken for a passive participle functioning as an adjective instead of a substantive!

Zimmermann did not address the problem of the variant in OG ελεεινος, the root concept of which is ‘pity’ and not ‘desire’. According to HP Dan 9:23; 10:11, 19 are

---

\(^\text{100}\) Cl, Vol 3, 249; KB3, Vol 1, 326. The lexicons construe תמדורן as a plural noun but BW, in its search facility, parses the word as an adjective: none list it as a Qal passive participle of תמדורן. Delitzsch, cf note 97, wrote that in Gen 27:15 תמדורן may be an adjective if בּADR may be feminine as in Lev 6:20, or it may be a substantive if בּADR is understood as repeated before it. Davidson, Gib, cf note 97, construe it in Gen 27:15 as an adjective which, after the annexation of genitives, and qualifying either member of the genitive construction, must stand outside it. ( This raises the possibility that the word could, after all, technically apply to Esau, though this is unlikely. ) Cl gives the clearest syntactic analysis of the word in Gen 27:15: it is a substantive in a nominal clause, ותמדורן אשא תמדורן הבשא תמדורן, the whole of which stands in apposition to בּADR תמדורן, ‘the garments...the precious things that were with her in the house’. A similar construction is found in Ezra 8:7.


the only places in LXX where this adjective is used. In 10:3; 11:43 OG employs ἐπιθυμία (for ἡμέραν), which is the Θ standard equivalent in 9:23; 10:3, 11, 19. In 11:38 ἐπιθυμία is used by both Greek texts and by Θ in 11:43. Thus the Greek texts employ variations of the standard Greek root for ‘desire’ for all occurrences of תְּהֶמֶרְדַּכ in MT of Daniel except for the above three examples in OG. The adjective ἑλεεινος is ambiguous since it can mean both ‘finding pity, pitied’ and ‘showing mercy, pitying’. It could therefore be an indicator of either a passive or an active form in the Vorlage. To account for three uses of ἑλεεινος by the same mechanical error occurring three times in either Hebrew or Aramaic may seem a remote possibility, but the context is the same in each case and this might have caused the same error every time. It is necessary to consider all three readings together since they constitute identical problems.

Dan 9:23  
MT יכ תמרות אתת  
4QDana אשת תמורת  
S יכ תמרות אתת  
Θ οτὶ ἄνθρ ἐπιθυμιῶν συ ἐὶ ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀνὴρ ἐπιθυμιῶν  
Syh οτὶ ἄνθρ ἐπιθυμητὸς εἶ  
V quia vir desideriorum es vir desideriorum vir desideriorum  
OG οτὶ ἑλεεινὸς εἶ ἀνθρωπὸς ἑλεεινὸς Άνθρωπος ἑλεεινὸς εἶ  
Syh οτὶ ἑλεεινὸς εἶ  

103 HR p lists the term under the spelling ἑλεεινος.
104 OG has for רְדַך in Gen 27:15, καλὸς; in 2 Esd 8:27, 2 Chr 20:25 it has ἐπιθυμητὸς. Θ has the latter word for רְדַך in Dan 11:8 where OG has ἐπιθυμημα and both have ἐπιθυμημα in 11:37. This all goes to show that there is no confusion with the concept of ‘pity’ in these places.
105 LS, Vol 1, 531. The lexicon records LXX use of this word to mean ‘having received mercy’, but this is on the basis of its use here in Daniel and presumably on its equivalent in MT which has a passive form.
106 Sic Bugatus, Daniel Secundum, 88.
Since Theodotion has ἀνὴρ in 9:23, supported by the Vulgate, ישן may have been in the Hebrew and dropped out: as it occurs in the first of the sequence, this is more likely than addition of the term in the Greek text under the influence of those that follow. Otherwise the Versions may have made their own clarifying additions. The Qumran variant with a definite article is probably the result of dittography of ἦτα as ἦ: it is not significant in this problem.

The major difference is the meaning ‘pity’ in OG and Syro-Hexapla when all the other versions support MT. There are three roots which could have been in the Hebrew Vorlage of OG to give the meaning ‘pited’, רחם והמל, הפקד.

Montgomery follows Bevan in suggesting OG had חסדים in Hebrew, after the meaning found in Sotah ix, ו الشريف ‘men of piety’. The trouble is that OG does not refer to ‘piety’ but ‘pity’: for the sense ‘pited’ the Hebrew would have been חסיד and confusion between Mem and Samek would account for the variation between OG and MT. OG may have had passive plural intensive חסיד in its Vorlage and turned it into a Greek singular adjective, or the final Tav may have been lost before matres lectionis were added.

Otherwise in חסיד an original Yod was perhaps read as Vav, or the OG translator misunderstood the expression ‘man of mercies / pious acts’ to mean a person who is pited. ‘Pious man’ is well suited to the context in which an angelic messenger responds to Daniel’s prayer, but there is no witness to this meaning.

107 MT also lacks the pronoun לָחֲמֵינָה after חסיד when its equivalent is found in the Versions, so there was perhaps some damage to the medium of MT.
108 Contrast pages 60, 68 where Zimmermann’s view of the definite article before ἦτα is described.
110 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 153; Montgomery, A Critical, 372.
111 The ease with which Mem and Samek could be confused is demonstrated in scripts like Cowley No. 7, 401 BCE, in Naveh, The Development, Fig 8 (4), and Cowley No 81, cursive, third century BCE, in Naveh, The Development, Fig 9 (5). It is not so with square scripts, late third century BCE and early first century BCE; cf Birnbaum, ‘The Hebrew’ Pt 1, 127, # 80; 144, # 87A.
Collins preferred the root דְּמָל as a solution\(^{112}\) without specifying the exact reading OG had in its Vorlage. If this was דומלתה, it would involve the confusion of Dalet and Lamed, requiring the loss of the upper stroke of Lamed, leaving the lower hook to resemble Dalet, and it would assume an intensive plural meaning ‘greatly pitied’ or ‘object of great compassion’. This solution does not improve on the one using חסורת.

Root דְּמָל could be confused with תַּמְל by the common confusion of Dalet and Resh and by metathesis. חסותרה similarly would yield a meaning ‘object of great compassion’. This root, of course, already has an intensive plural form in רַחַם, ‘compassion’, which might be confused with חסורתה without matres lectionis. A comparison of all suggested solutions in this form would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>חסורת</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>חסר</td>
<td>חסורת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דמל</td>
<td>חסורת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דומל</td>
<td>חסורת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| דומל | רוחמ |}

Clearly חסדר provides the easiest solution in terms of graphic confusion and this is probably the best Hebrew solution.

Intensive plural רַחַם as the original could have given rise to MT if matres lectionis, Vav and Yod, for a passive form were added later, after or before the metathesis of Resh / Dalet. The OG, if active, could have arisen from the form רַחַמִּים later written as רוחמ |. If passive, its Vorlage may have had רוחמ |.

\(^{112}\) Collins, Daniel, 345.
That הָרָדַּמְלִים could have been the original has one other factor in its favour: besides the senses ‘love, pity’ it can also mean ‘prayer’. This would give the best meaning of all, because it is specific to the context in which ch 9 contains the prayer of Daniel, better even than ‘pious man’: but, like that meaning, there is no witness to support it.

For a solution in Aramaic it is necessary to find a root which can mean both ‘desired / loved’, the meaning in MT, and ‘pitied / showing pity’, the meaning in OG. Of the roots examined in Hebrew, Aramaic has no cognate for דָּמַל, or for דָּטָר meaning to ‘be merciful, kind’. The root דָּלִים in Aramaic has the same limitations as the Hebrew, and similarly יָגוּט means only ‘desire, long for, covet’. The root דָּרָד according to Ja has the semantic range ‘love, pity’ in the Peal and Pael, and ‘be loved, be shown mercy, be moved to pity, show pity’ in the Ithpeal and Ithpael. Its use in the Genesis Apocryphon indicates it can also mean ‘desire’ so that the passive can mean ‘favourite’. It is possible, therefore, to find an Aramaic solution which does not entail any mechanical error: דָּרָד could have given rise to Hebrew דָּלִים, ‘desired, favourite, beloved’, and to a passive meaning in OG ‘pitied’. A plural form, דָּרָדִים / יָגוּטִים, could have given rise to an active meaning in Greek, ‘showing pity’; but it would require an extra Yod to give rise to MT reading from דָּרָדִים / יָגוּטִים, through use of an additional mater lectionis. The solution with the singular form is the simplest and therefore the most likely: the solution with the plural makes the meaning ‘man of prayer’ easier to justify than in Hebrew.

113 Ja, Vol 2, 1467.
114 Ibid.
115 QapGn 20.8; 21.21; Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 62, 70. 2.20 has the reading דָּרָד which Fitzmyer, pp 52-3, translates ‘a favorite and one desired’. The two expressions seem to be near synonyms: cf T Muraoka, ‘Qumran Aramaic’ in SQA, 95, 96 a. (39). KB3, Vol 3, 1216, under דָּרָד cites J Hoftijzer & K Jongeling, Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions, (1995, Leiden, E J Brill), 1068 where the root can mean ‘love, care for, have compassion, like, want’.
Zimmermann’s Evidence, and Textual Study: Part 2

11:2

MT  יִניֵר הָבָל אָתָּה מַלְכָּת יִתְנַו

V  concitabit omnes adversum regnum Graeciae

4QDan⁶  יַעֲרָד הָבָל מַלְכָּת

OG  ἐπαναστησεται παντὶ βασιλεῖ βασιλείων

Syh  כָּל הַמֶּלֶךְ וּבֵשׁ

θ  ἐπαναστησεται πασσις βασιλειας Ελληνων

S  כָּל הַמֶּלֶךְ וּבֵשׁ

α  διεγερεῖ τον παντα συν τοις βασιλευσι ελληνων

σ  διεγερεῖ παντας προς την βασιλειαν της γης τον

ελληνων

Zimmermann retroverted MT to Aramaic, יִניֵר הָבָל אָתָּה מַלְכָּת יִתְנַו, and assumed יִעְרָד הָבָל מַלְכָּת was misread as a sign of the direct object instead of the preposition.¹ Hartman translated ‘he will incite the whole kingdom of Greece’, after transposing לַגֵּד before בְּבַל.² Collins does not indicate a transposition, but translates ‘he will stir up everything, even the kingdom of Greece’ (which is the translation that Bevan attributed to Von Lengerke, but which he himself considered meaningless³). Neither of these modern commentators takes up the translation suggestion of Ewald, ‘all that will arouse the kingdom of Yavan’.⁴ He took the antecedent of ‘all’ to be עָשָׂה, the wealth (and accompanying power) of the king of Persia, and thus he retained the position of לַגֵּד in MT. It seems that in a century of study there has been little

¹ Cf page 68.
² Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 257, note m-m.
⁴ Ewald, A Commentary, 294
progress in understanding the precise meaning of this clause in MT, though the historical allusion is broadly understood.

The Versions witness to some variation in meaning, but with the same historical context of the rise of Greece against Persia. Montgomery thought that all the Versions had a text identical with MT, but Charles asserted that MT’s ‘most unusual Hebrew’ was unsupported by the Versions. In fact each version has a slightly different reading and none precisely supports the consonants of MT. There is, however, support for the meaning ‘against (the kingdom)’, required by Zimmermann’s theory, in the Vulgate’s adversum, in Symmachus’ προς, and in the idioms of OG ἐπαναστησθαι πάντι, i.e. use of the dative case. Here the Greek verb is intransitive, giving the sense ‘he will rise up against (every)’. The Syro-Hexapla supports OG.

Retroversions of the Versions into Hebrew compared with Hebrew witnesses could be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>יוער עלא את מלכות יח'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDan&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>יוער עבל מלכותות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG, 967 &gt; Heb</td>
<td>יוער על כל מלך יח'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ &gt; Heb</td>
<td>יוער על מלכות יח'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &gt; Heb</td>
<td>יוער על מלכות יח'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V &gt; Heb</td>
<td>יוער את ההבל על מלכות יח'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α &gt; Heb</td>
<td>יוער את ההבל את מלבי יח'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ</td>
<td>יוער את כל על מלכות ארא יח'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>5</sup> Montgomery, *A Critical*, 424, asserted that the Versions ‘doubtless possessed our text’.
Firstly, it is evident that the singular verb and בֵּל are invariably witnessed in all the Versions, although it is possible that ἐπαναστήσεται of OG and Theodotion may be the equivalent of Qal יִתְנָה or Niphal יִתְנָה.

Secondly, the different readings מלך מלכי, מלכה, מלכתי and are not difficult to explain in terms of mechanical errors in Hebrew, since it has already been observed that Vav followed by Nun could be mistaken for Tav, and the confusion of Yod with Vav is a common occurrence. The following word יִתְנָה could have been the cause of the mix up, though, since haplography or dittography are equally possible, it is not easy to argue which, if any, may be original. The progressive loss of consonants could have been: מלך 민 > מלכי 민 > מלכת 민 > מלכה 민. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the first transition could more easily have occurred in Aramaic because the feminine construct noun מלכת could be singular or plural whereas in Hebrew the loss of Yod must be adduced from מלכת. After this the corruptions would have followed the same pattern as in Hebrew. Yet the unique reading of Symmachus must be taken into account.

There is no textual reason in Hebrew or Greek for the variant γνης which appears in Symmachus, and it could hardly be an explanatory gloss since it is a pleonasm. Aramaic supplies a textual solution to the reading, which supports the retroversion suggested by Zimmermann, demonstrated by the following:

MT > Aram יִתְנָה לְכָלָה מַלְכָּות אֲדֹנָי
σ > Aram יִתְנָה לְכָלָה מַלְכָּות אֲדֹנָי

Aramaic construct יִתְנָה could have been read if Aleph of מַלְכָּות was taken as the beginning of the next word, leaving מַלְכָּות as the construct noun, if Dalet was read

---

6 Hitzig, according to Bevan, remarked that ‘kingdom of Greece’ showed the author thought Greece was an oriental monarchy, but it may be that ‘kingdoms’ was the more accurate original.
as Resh and if Yod was read as Ayin, a possible confusion noted previously. This variant is all the more telling textually for its insignificance in the narrative.

Aramaic would also account for the difference between the Versions in the number of the noun since מַלְכוּת, like the construct form, could be singular or plural, but the reading in Symmachus depends upon a longer Aramaic construction for the genitive relationship. Yet this cannot accommodate very easily a confusion between מַלְכוּת and מַלֶּכֶת: the OG βασιλεύ and α βασιλεύει can better be traced to Hebrew error as described above.

In the light of this evidence in Symmachus, it is now possible to consider Zimmermann’s original thesis concerning the Aramaic particle ב behind the use of מַלְכוּת in MT. It is notable that the consonants of מַלְכוּת in MT are supported by Aquila’s κύριος, the equivalent of מַלְכוּת; on the other hand there is textual support in OG, Symmachus and the Vulgate for Hebrew ב ע or בָּא, which was Zimmermann’s suggestion for a correct sense. Since Hebrew מַלְכוּת and בָּא could both be traced to Aramaic ב and there is certainly textual support for both of these Hebrew readings, Zimmermann’s explanation does bear some weight.

Against all this is the witness of 4QDan which has no מַלְכוּת: did the scribe of this manuscript omit the sign as making no sense? This is one possible explanation. Another might suggest מַלְכוּת in MT is a misplaced correction, which should have preceded בָּא. Yet neither of these account for the prepositions and datives found in the above Versions.

7 Cf Chapter Four, pages 136-7.
8 Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 59, with respect to κατασκηνων in the OG and κρατησα in 0 in 11:2, thought that 0 may actually represent the ‘o’ text and OG may be a later recension: this may be the case also with βασιλευ in OG.
It is not clear what are the implications of finding textual support for an Aramaic substrata in the text of both Jerome and a second century Greek variant such as Symmachus, unless it be assumed that there were a number of Aramaic variant readings which gave rise to different Hebrew recensions. Errors with reading common Aramaic particles ו and ב may have been easily noticed by copyists if they were aware that their Hebrew text originated in Aramaic. It is possible that these errors go back to one Hebrew text translated from an Aramaic Vorlage, and that some copies were subsequently corrected and others were not, and this is reflected in different witnesses to MT.

Whether it is possible to trace an original reading for the difficult words דבל את in MT is hard to demonstrate. Retroversions into Hebrew and Aramaic illustrate the complexity of such a process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MT     | דבל את מלוכלך וי
| 4QDan  | דבל מלוכלך וי
| S      | ב
| OG, θ  | על ב
| V, σ   | את דבל על
| α      | דבל לא

There are a number of ways these texts may have developed. It is noticeable in MT that דבל את has three radicals in common with מלוכלך: in some scripts He and Aleph were similar in form⁹ and in others Kaph and Vav might resemble a ligature of

---

⁹ See Cross, ‘The Development’, 137, fig 1, lines 2 (3rd century, vulgar), and 6 (archaic, semi-formal, 175-125 BCE).
It is quite possible that MT is a conflation of an erroneous reading and its correction. On the other hand, both the Qumran reading and Aquila seem to witness to variations in the way אָתָה was added to the text when it was thought necessary. 4QDan$^e$ supports the difficult article in however, so the Dead Sea text does not solve the whole problem.

Kaph could be confused with Resh in some Jewish scripts,$^{11}$ so in Aramaic could have arisen from dittography of Resh, in עיר, and Lamed in לְמֵלְכוֹתָהּ.

In the case of the conflate MT, the original reading would have been מַלְכוּת הָיוֹן, ‘the kingdom of Greece will rouse itself’. The above error in Aramaic would give the original text as יָرمز לְמֵלְכוֹתָהּ דִּי יוֹן, ‘he will arouse the kingdom of Greece’. Tracing permutations of either of these errors in Hebrew or Aramaic to produce the meanings of the Versions would be complex and long. At this point it seems best to assess the probability of a solution in each language as about even.

---

$^{10}$ Ibid.; lines 3 (archaic, 3rd century), and 7 (archaic, semiformal, 175-125 BCE).

$^{11}$ Ibid.
Zimmermann’s first solution took account of OG variant ὅποια τιν ἀλκην αὐτοῦ. Few have found a way to explain this variant, except Collins who suggests OG read ῬΩΗΣ, but he is not sure of the graphic transition from ΡΩΗΣ and it is certainly not a good graphic match with MT because of the Qoph. BHS similarly can only suggest ΒΗΒΗΡ with a query, and this is not even as close as Collins’ attempt.

Zimmermann thought the Greek translator read an Aramaism into the Hebrew: some form of Aramaic root ῬΩΗΣ for MT תֹּֽואֶה. An Aramaic word was sometimes read into MT by a LXX or other translator, just as Aramaic words were sometimes used by Hebrew authors, but this does not indicate an Aramaic Vorlage. Zimmermann did not entertain a simple graphic error in Aramaic between נָאָֽה, ‘power’, and נָאָֽו, ‘succeeding’. Targ Ps 109:13 reads, נִֽוָּדִי אֶֽתֶֽנֶּלֶתֶֽיִּֽו מְֽדִֽוֹֽאָֽו נָאָֽוָֽאָֽוָֽא which appears in a phrase with and describing נְדִֽוָּדֵי נִֽוָּדִי, parallel to where which translates MT תֹּֽואֶה. This only witnesses to נָאָֽו as an adjective modifying נְדִֽוָּדֵי, but it could have been used as a substantive in Daniel. So the variant in OG may have an Aramaic source in common with MT, but without further

---

12 P967 has a scribal error in ὅποια; cf Geissen, Papyrus 967, 245; Collins, Daniel, 363, note 3.
13 Montgomery, A Critical, 426, only queried it, and Jeanson, The Old Greek, 75, ignored it.
14 Collins, Daniel, 363.
15 See examples of this in LXX and Targum supplied in Chapter Seven, pages 332-3.
16 Cf e.g. Zimmermann’s list in Chapter Two, pages 58-9.
attestation of this Aramaic usage, it should be regarded also with a degree of uncertainty.

11:7  

MT  נָבָא אֵלֶּה תּוֹתְל
did not.  
θ  καὶ ἥξει πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν  
S  καὶ ἥξεσθαι  
V  et venit cum exercitu  
OG  καὶ ἥξει ἐπὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ  
967  καὶ ἥξει ἐπὶ τὴν ἐνεργεῖαν εαυτοῦ  
Syrh  καὶ ἥξεται ἐπὶ τὴν ἐνεργεῖαν εαυτοῦ

In this clause Zimmermann saw evidence of misreading of Aramaic particle  ל, which was meant to be a sign of the accusative, but was taken as a preposition: that  ל далף נא ל далף נא gave rise to Hebrew ל далף נא ל далף נא, which should have read ל далף נא ל далף נא.17 This theory also involved the misreading of the verb ב עלי as a simple active verb ‘he will come’, instead of a causative ‘he will cause to come/bring’. The same verbal misreading is possible in Hebrew, but misunderstanding of ל is not.18

Ginsberg elaborated on Zimmermann’s view, maintaining the original Aramaic had a third masculine singular suffix, ל далף נא ל далף נא, ‘his army’ (accusative), which had been misread as an emphatic ending, hence the definite article in Hebrew.19

OG and Papyrus 967, with the Syro-Hexapla, support Ginsberg’s idea, since they all indicate a third masculine singular possessive pronoun; but there is no support for

17 Cf page 60.
18 Although ל was sometimes used as sign of the accusative in Hebrew, this was an Aramaism and cannot be adduced as evidence for a Hebrew solution.
19 Cf page 60 again.
Zimmermann's theory. Moreover OG, 967, 0, S and Syh could all support a meaning of a preposition as 'against', since Greek επί and προς and Syriac 蹶 can all carry this sense in certain contexts. If this is the import of the text, then 'the army' and the possessive pronouns in OG and Syh must refer to the king of the north.20 Even MT is not as meaningless as Zimmermann thought, since it would be notable if the new king joined the army in the field in person.21 Nevertheless, the error which Zimmermann detected is possible in an Aramaic text.

Bevan wanted to read the meaning 'he will bring an army ( against them )' but he had to amend the text to do this and assume the meaning 'against' for מָיָה as in 8:7.22 Charles said that 'with his army' would be expected rather than 'to the army' ( cf 11:13 where MT reads מָיָה ), but he preferred the sense 'march against the army'.23

Retroversions for comparison could be as follows:

continued...
Clearly the difference between the definite noun and the form with a pronoun suffix is more easily explained in Aramaic than in Hebrew. With the latter it is possible to imagine the loss of the third masculine singular suffix ٍ before the conjunction that follows, but the He of the definite article must be explained by a second error such as an inaccurate reduplication of Het. With Aramaic it is simply a case of confusing two consonantal homographs ﴢ and ﴣ.

The question of the preposition, which is raised by Zimmermann’s explanation, is complicated by the various prepositions used by the Versions. The graphic, or phonetic, confusion between ﴤ and ﴤ in Hebrew is attested in Qumran Hebrew. In Aramaic a confusion between ﴤ and ﴤ could easily have come about under the influence of the preceding verb ﴤ. The occurrence of ﴥ in the Vulgate is more difficult to explain, though a scribal error of ﴥ for ﴤ is possible. A Semitic text

---

24 This is not an unusual error: cf 4QDan² for ﴤ in 10:19; cf page 243.
25 See e.g. Kutscher E Y, The Language and Linguistic, 403-5, especially p 403, note 1: Kutscher
with ב would encompass the meanings of all the Versions, but it is perhaps less likely that this would be rendered by ל in MT.

Whichever of these is viewed as a viable explanation, it is apparent that Zimmermann’s recourse to a misread Aramaic particle ב, though feasible, is not necessary in view of the evidence of the Versions.

The issue of whether it is possible to trace one ‘original’ preposition can only be discussed in the context of the textual problems in the verse as a whole, since there is one less verb in OG and this changes the meaning considerably.

MT

 thieves shall smite the end of the heaven and of the earth, but it will be

καὶ στηρίζεται ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθώς της ρίζης αὐτῆς της ἐκτοιμασίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἥξει προς τὴν δύναμιν καὶ ἐισελευσθεὶς εἰς τὰ ὑποστηρίγματα του Βασιλείου του Βορρα καὶ ποιηθεὶ καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ κατασχεῖ.

S

et stabit de germine radicum eius plantatio et venit cum exercitu et ingredietur provinciam regis aquilonis et abutetur eius et obtinebit

OG

καὶ ἀναστησεῖ καθὼς ἐκ τῆς ρίζης αὐτοῦ καθ’ ἐκκοτοῦ, καὶ ἥξει ἐπὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἵσχυ αὐτοῦ βασιλείῳ Βορρα καὶ ποιηθεὶ ταραχὴ καὶ κατασχεῖ.

Syh

et stabit de germine radicum eius plantatio et venit cum exercitu et ingredietur provinciam regis aquilonis et abutetur eius et obtinebit

Retroversions into Hebrew for comparison with MT could be as follows:

listed ten interchanges between ב and ל.
The last two clauses of this verse have been dealt with in detail in Chapter Four.²⁶

The difference between MT and θ is minor and it can best be accounted for in terms of the transposition of Vav from $\text{מִלָּה}$ to $\text{בֵּית}$, with Vav then read as Yod to make $\text{מלָּה}$. The same process could account for OG אֶֽהָ֖יְנוּ $\text{אָֽתוֹ} \text{וְּ} \text{רֹֽאְשָׁ֗ה},$ which would be the equivalent of $\text{בֵּית}$ or $\text{בֵּיתוֹ}$, but if Mem was lost before Bet.

The Vulgate broadly follows MT.²⁷ The lack of an equivalent for the pronoun suffix for $\text{ןָּל}$ can easily be explained as a loss of Vav in Hebrew before the following

²⁶ Cf Chapter Four, pages 157-9.
²⁷ It is not certain that the common genitive pronoun eius, which could be masculine, feminine or
conjunction. Abutetur seems to have taken וְהָתַשָּׁה מֵעֲשָׂה in the sense of 'do / work against, misuse'. Provinciam is not an obvious equivalent of מֵעֲשָׂה.

The Peshitta faithfully supports MT except for addition of preposition לו twice. There seems to be no textual reason for these additions and the translator probably added them to smooth the meaning, as noticed on other occasions. Although לו could have been added before יָּבִן to accord with other uses in Daniel, it is notable that preposition מִן has not been moved to its more logical place as demonstrated by the OG.

There are four differences between MT and OG which need explanation.  

a) The preposition מִן seems to have been transposed from before יָּבִן to before יָּשָׁר, unless it should be understood as partitive.28

b) The form יָּשָׁר was apparently in the Vorlage of OG instead of יָּשָׁר מֵעַי of MT.  

c) The phrase קְדָרִי וָאֵעַ תְוָי appears to be the equivalent of יָּבִין.

d) OG lacks a second verb קְאָר וַזֶּּכָּר to be the equivalent of the second קְאָר יָּבִין of MT.

a) The preposition מִן in MT could be explained in terms of a reduplication of Dalet from יָּבִין or Nun from יָּבִין29 but it is more difficult to see why מִן should have been lost before יָּשָׁרש. Of course a Greek translator could easily have corrected the strange reading of MT or it could have been corrected in the Vorlage of OG. Retroversion to Aramaic of the clause could be as follows:

28 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 176, and Montgomery, A Critical, 432, thought that מִן could be partitive (after יָּשָׁר מֵעַי of 11:5).

29 In general, confusion between Mem and Nun requires only the loss of the left vertical / oblique stroke of Mem, but with Dalet the loss of the bottom horizontal stroke from Mem is required as well: it does of course depend on particular graphic styles; cf Cross, 'The Development', 137.
It is immediately apparent that can could easily have arisen from dittography in Aramaic of Mem and Nun between the two words זֶר נַשׁ. As with Hebrew, it is difficult to explain in mechanical terms why should have appeared before שֶרֶשׁ, unless the genitive construction had been זֶר נַשׁ שֶרֶשׁ and had become corrupted to נַשׁ. Otherwise, at this stage, it must be counted as a deliberate correction of the sense of the text.

b) The difference in Hebrew between the plural noun with third feminine singular suffix, שֶרֶשׁ, and the singular noun with third masculine singular suffix, שֶרֶשׁ as represented by OG, can be accounted for in terms of the loss of He, and Yod read as Vav. In Aramaic the difference is more easily explicable since the masculine and feminine third singular suffixes are both represented by He, and the Yod only need be assumed lost.

c) לֵב poses a great difficulty here: modern translators and commentators tend to translate it like לֵב in 11: 20, 21, 38. The OG equivalent appears to be καθ' εαυτόν which is equally puzzling. It has been suggested that OG read הַנְּמָה which would assume that Nun had been read in MT for Mem of OG equivalent, and that He and a Vav had been lost. On the other hand, if MT was original, then perhaps He was transposed from the suffix of שֶרֶשׁ and Vav was duplicated from the conjunction following.

30 Bevan, cf note 28, considered the phrase adverbial, meaning the same with or without the preposition, like the phrase וּבְדֵי הַמֵּדָר (ב).  
31 Charles, A Critical, 280. Collins, Daniel, 364 note 19, thinks this uncertain. Montgomery listed θ's ετοιμασίας as derived from דָּמָה, but since it shares a common root with כָּל and can mean 'station, place' there is no reason why כָּל should not have been in the θ Vorlage.
Aramaic for MT might be יָמְנוּ, ‘his place’, but could OG be retroverted to יָמְנוּ, ‘after him’? The Greek preposition κατὰ can mean ‘like’, i.e. ‘after the fashion of’, and κατὰ έγκυμον can mean ‘in one’s own rank of life’, but it is not clear that Aramaic יָמְנוֹ can carry this sense. Its common usage is temporal, ‘after him’, and this meaning is equally suitable in context as ‘like him’; in which case, if the Aramaic can assume the latter meaning at all, it seems strange that a translator did not understand this common temporal meaning for יָמְנוֹ. To accommodate the readings of MT and OG, Bet must also have dropped out or arisen after He of the third person singular suffix in Aramaic.

None of these explanations seems satisfactory and it is necessary to examine the meaning of noun יָמְנוֹ in Hebrew. KB3 lists five homonyms in the form of יָמְנוֹ: the root יָמְנוֹ yields the sense ‘place, position, office’, which is the meaning usually attributed to it in Daniel by modern English translators: the root יָמְנוֹ gives the sense ‘stand, base’; but in one reference, Ps 80:16, the meaning ‘shoot, stock’ is apparent. The latter sense seems to fit the context in Daniel 11:7; but if יָמְנוֹ means ‘his stock’, here in MT without a preposition, it would appear to be an alternative to יָמְנוֹ, ‘her roots’. Given the historical context, it would not be surprising if it was not clear whether the relationship between Ptolemy III and Berenice was referred to, or that between Ptolemy II and III. This would account for the different suffixes suggested by OG and MT for יָמְנוֹ as noted in b), though it might naturally be expected that a son would come from the stock of his father rather than his sister. All this evidence points in the direction of conflation in MT of two readings יָמְנוֹ and יָמְנוֹ, and of OG יָמְנוּ יְזָרָא אֲבֵד representing the reading יָמְנוֹ. Then the question arises as to why there should be two different nouns in MT.

32 LS, Vol 1, 883, IV:3.
33 See KB3, Vol 2, 483, III יָמְנוּ 1: BDB, 487 lists all the above meanings except the last under יָמְנוֹ, and on 488 the term in Ps 80:16 is described as a feminine noun יָמְנוֹ. KB3 follows J G Fevrier, ‘Vocabulaire Sacrificiel Punique’, JA 243 (1955), 49-63 (54), in reading יָמְנוֹ in Ps 80:16 with a third
It is interesting to note that HP lists ḫtzzα as being the equivalent of קַנ only in Dan 11:7, in both OG and 0. In fact 0 appears to conflate MT and OG readings in this verse, until it is realised that MT is conflate, and 0 translated it. It is significant that OG has a similar start to 11:20, where MT has ḫל כָּנָן, as here in v 7. The OG beginning of 11:20 appears to have little connection to the beginning in MT (where there is no form of שִׁרְשָׁה in that verse), but several scholars, trying to explain OG ḫtzzα in 11:20, suggest it was influenced by the introduction in v 7. This explanation is unnecessary because the meaning ‘his stock’ for כָּנ supplies the connection between OG and MT in each verse.

There is another use of ḫtzzα in 0, in 2:41, where it is the equivalent of Aramaic ḫnēmēn. This noun, which means ‘planting, plot’, is used in the Genesis Apocryphon in the context of the dispute between Lamech and his wife as to who was responsible for her pregnancy.

Retroversion of OG 11:7a to Aramaic using this noun would give a reading

{{Israel rotates text 90 degrees clockwise}}

and it can be seen that this one word would account for:

i) the two nouns שִׁרְשָׁה and כָּנ in MT, being alternative renderings of the metaphor ‘planting, plot’:

ii) the difference in number in the noun שִׁרְשָׁה as exhibited in MT and כָּנ in OG Hebrew equivalent, since the Aramaic feminine noun form could be singular or plural:

---

feminine singular suffix, קָנ.

34 Cf pages 268-84 for a detailed discussion of problems in 11:20.

35 1 QapGen ar 1:1; II:15.
iii) the difference between the masculine suffix in OG equivalent and the feminine in MT since the Aramaic third singular suffixes masculine and feminine are consonantly identical:

iv) the displacement of the preposition מִן because of confusion in the run of letters מ נוֹוֹת נֶא... This would have been a particularly difficult sequence of letters to read accurately if final forms were not in use.

d) For MT רֶבֶן בְּמֶעֶה מֶלֶךְ יְצֵפֹן the OG Hebrew equivalent would have been:

בְּמֶעֶה מֶלֶךְ יְצֵפֹן.

The difference between the pronoun suffix and lack of it on the noun מֶעֶה has been explained in terms of Hebrew; cf page 258; and this difference has allowed OG to construe the king of the north as the subject in the nominative case rather than the owner of a stronghold in the genitive case (as in Theodotion’s reading). Moreover, since there is no equivalent of the second verb in the OG reading, the king of the north becomes the subject of the first verb, רֶבֶן, and this gives the opposite sense to that of MT where the king of the south is the subject of both verbs. This difference in meaning appears to have led the OG translator to understand the meaning of מֶעֶה as ‘strength’ and not ‘stronghold’.

It is possible to find a reason why the second verb should either have been lost or have arisen in Hebrew through mechanical means, if the readings are compared thus.

דָּהַוֶּל חַוֶּל בְּמֶעֶה

The Vav prefixed to the verb may have become attached to the preceding noun as a third masculine singular suffix (or vice versa), and Yod of the verb could have fallen out or arisen from confusion in the sequence ...וֹל... or from simple confusion with Vav. There would also have been confusion between בַּמֶּה and ...בַּמֶּה.
A retroversion into Aramaic poses the same problem as in 11:39, in that there is a wide choice of vocabulary to render the meanings ‘stronghold’ and ‘strength’ in one word.\textsuperscript{36} In 11:7, however, there are two singular nouns to be accounted for and not a noun and adjective, and this probably discounts the noun מַסְיָר being confused with חַזֶּק ‘strong’. This leaves two possibilities for the Aramaic equivalent of בֵּית מָלֵךְ, i.e. דֶּרֶךְ דִּיֶּל (or מַרְכֵּש) and לְכֶלֶך (or מַרְכֵּש).

Aramaic retroversions using these two nouns and construct forms could be as follows.

\begin{align*}
\text{MT} & >\text{Aram} & \text{יוֹעֵל חָצְיוֹלָה וַעֲלָה בְּתַכְּקָה מָלֵךְ גָּרְבֵּיהּ} \\
\text{OG} & >\text{Aram} & \text{וֹעֵל חָצְיוֹלָה בְּתַכְּקָה מָלֵךְ גָּרְבֵּיהּ}
\end{align*}

Confusion is possible in this text because of the similarity between Ayin and Yod. The second verb could have developed from a reduplication of חָצְיוֹלָה thus

\begin{align*}
\text{ד} & \text{ב} \\
\text{ר} & \text{ע}
\end{align*}

Equally the verb may have fallen out because of the influence of חָצְיוֹלָה. Another notable possibility is that the preposition ל, which in Zimmermann’s view gave rise to the troublesome לָא in MT, could be a dittography of the last consonant of the first verb. If this were the case, the original sense could have been ‘the army will come to the stronghold’ and the second verb would certainly be a later addition, but there is no textual support for this interpretation. Zimmermann’s preferred meaning ‘he will bring the army’, or, with the OG variation, ‘he will bring his army’, is of course still a possibility, and there is no objective way of deciding between these readings apart from appeal to history. Nevertheless, in the context of warfare, it does seem a banality to note that the king brought his army with him! It would seem more significance to note as MT implies, that the king joined his army in person.

\textsuperscript{36} Cf Chapter Four, pages 190-1; though in 11:39 the range was ‘stronghold’ and ‘fortress’.
Yet another solution to the problem in this section of text can be found if חיל is used as the basis for משי of MT.

MT > Aram
חיל לחדלה שחיל בחל למלך גרבי

OG > Aram
חיל לחדלה בחל למלך גרבי

Clearly there is more potential for confusion in an Aramaic text using חיל rather than חק, and when the similarities between the two clauses are considered (and the similarity in meaning between them is to some extent apparent both in MT and OG), there must be a suspicion that MT and OG represent conflate readings. OG may represent a conflation of חיל with two, alternative prepositions and MT may be a conflation of two clauses with verb and noun and different prepositions. The alternative readings could have arisen because of the fluidity in the meaning of the prepositions involved or because of the ambiguity of the term חיל in this context, since it has the semantic range in Aramaic ‘strength, strong, army, stronghold’.

There are too many differing solutions in Aramaic to allow a definitive decision concerning the ‘original’ text in these clauses, but it is notable that in both this section of v 7 and in the previous there is evidence of conflation, particularly in MT. Equally possible is that what is described here is simply the clash of two armies, if the OG retroversion to Aramaic (above) was the original.
Zimmermann explained the feminine third singular suffix as an error in Aramaic for a masculine third singular one which would have required no change of consonants. His suggested Aramaic text לְבָּכַל, read by a translator as לְבָּכַל, ‘to destroy her’, when the author intended לְבָּכַל, ‘to his hurt’, he later altered to לְבָּכַל from the root לְבָּכַל (meaning ‘her hurt / destruction’), confused with לְבָּכַל, from the root לְבָּכַל, meaning ‘pledge / security’. So his version of the text ran ‘he shall give the daughter of men for a surety’.38

Ginsberg agreed that confusion occurred between the Aramaic pronominal suffixes, but he preferred an infinitive לְבָּכַל, which should have resulted in Hebrew לְבָּכַל. Hartman also referred to the error in reading an Aramaic suffix, but he did not link this to any textual witnesses.39 Many of the earlier commentators, including Montgomery and Charles, translated ‘to destroy it’, taking the antecedent of the feminine suffix to be the kingdom (of Egypt), this, however, is some distance back in the text and not as near as מְלָכָה, the immediate antecedent.40 The Vulgate has a neuter pronoun, whose antecedent is regnum, probably representing a Semitic feminine one referring to מְלָכָה. Jerome therefore had the feminine form of the suffix in his manuscript, aligning him with MT and supporting Montgomery.

37 Cf Geissen, Papyrus 967, 254.
38 These may have been Pual forms which Zimmermann suggested, but I have been unable to affirm from the lexicons that they existed.
40 Montgomery, A Critical, 441-2; Charles, A Critical, 290.
and Charles. Collins, on the basis of 4QDanę and Pap 967, translates ‘to destroy him’.41

The division of the witnesses to this word is an interesting one since each ancient language has one witness per reading. Unusually, OG is aligned with MT and Θ against Pap 967, the Peshitta and 4QDanę.

A comparison of the witnesses to the two sides might lead to the conclusion that there has been some internal misreading or even interpretative activity. The reading in the Peshitta, of course, could very easily be an internal error, serving to illustrate Zimmermann’s point that such a confusion would be easy in Aramaic. The difference between OG and Pap 967 might also be considered an internal error since it requires only the misreading of one letter, though there is no evidence elsewhere in OG of Daniel and Pap 967 of a similar discrepancy.42 It is more likely that OG has been corrected towards MT and that 967 is the original Old Greek. The evidence of MT and 4QDanę perhaps suggests an early copyist’s error appeared in the Hebrew text. Ulrich explained the difference in terms of Hebrew orthography, 4QDanę having the more common form of the suffix and MT reading נפנפ, cf 11:10 נפנפ. Given that there is a variation in the two Hebrew witnesses, it must be acknowledged that the Greek versions are probably reflecting this variation, rather than an internal Greek error unrelated to a Hebrew manuscript.

41 Collins, Daniel, 365, note 60.

42 There are many variations of pronoun between the two Greek texts, but none entails confusion of αὐτοῦ and αὐτην. Variants recorded by Geissen and Hamm are as follows:

W. Hamm, Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap 1-2, Nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967 (1976, Bonn, Rudolf Habelt Verlag); Vol I, 238, ch 2:25 αυτά: αυτό; 278, ch 2:48, αυτό; 446, ch 4:12 (15), αυτο: αυτο; 486, ch 4:28 (31), αυτην: - ; Geissen, Papyrus 967, 104, ch 7:12, - αυτε: αυτο; 158, ch 5:36, - : αυταν: 168, ch 6:20, αυτον: - ; 176, ch 6: 32-33 ?, αυτον: αυτον; 252, ch 11:13, - : ηπιτην. This evidence does not preclude an internal Greek error between αυτον and αυτην, but it does illustrate that confusion between Omicron and Eta is less likely than between Omicron and Alpha or Omega. The occurrence of the pronoun in one Greek text and its complete omission from the other, as in examples listed above, is a problem of greater magnitude than the one under discussion and probably has no bearing on it.

It is questionable how frequently there was confusion between a masculine and feminine third singular pronominal suffix in BH. If it could be shown to be only an occasional error in other texts, this might support the likelihood of it having happened here in Dan 11:17. However it is incontrovertible that the confusion between the two suffixes in question is easier in Aramaic than in Hebrew, since in Aramaic it is only a matter of pointing in the common forms of the suffixes. It is unnecessary to accept all of Zimmermann’s suggestions for retroversion into Aramaic: Ginsberg employed a straightforward infinitive for an infinitive, and his suggestion is therefore superior, but all the textual evidence that is available cannot weaken the force of Zimmermann’s original observation, that this looks more like a misreading of Aramaic than of Hebrew.

11:20 MT מַעֲבָרָה נֹגֵשׁ חַדָּר מֵלָכֹת
          θ παραβιβαζόν πρασσόν δοξαν βασιλείας
          S מָלִכָּה מְלַכָּה
          OG άνηρ τυπτον δοξαν βασιλεως
          Syh מִלָּה מִלָּה
          V vilissimus et indignus decore regio

Zimmermann’s and Ginsberg’s view of this phrase as nonsense was supported by Hartman, who said MT meant, ‘one sending over an exactor ( slave-driver ) of splendor of kingdom’, which was ‘sheer gibberish’.44 Zimmermann’s retroversion to מָדַר רַדֵּשׁ שָׁלְטַן יָוֵר מֵלָכֵּר was influenced by use of שָׁלְטַן in Dan 7:14, in a similar run of three words, and Targum Jonathan’s שָׁלְטַן for נֵגֶר in Zech 9:8. He thought a translator misinterpreted שָׁלְטַן in an original Aramaic as ‘exactor, ruler’ instead of

44 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 268.
‘dominion, authority’. Ginsberg thought the Peshitta, which uses the same word here for נון, was perhaps influenced by 7:14 even though חלץ does not mean ‘dominion’ in 11:20 as it does in ch 7.

Many scholars have found MT in this section of text perfectly sensible, reading in it a reference to the reign of Seleucus IV, Philopater, and to Heliodorus, the tax-collector who ultimately poisoned Seleucus. Charles accepted MT and thought the sense of נון was clear as ‘exactor’. In contrast, Hartman’s view may seem an extreme judgement on MT, and clearly, in the phrase מלכות, זכר מלכות could be interpreted adjectivally to give the sense ‘royal splendour’. Yet it must be admitted this is an imprecise description of what was exacted, and it only adds to the strangeness of the reading in MT.

PS 565 lists, among meanings for חלץ, ‘ruler, commander’ (which may be general terms for נון), but the word can carry connotations of a lesser ruler. Nevertheless root שלח is a possible Aramaic source for the Hebrew term: in fact שלח, according to Ja has the semantic range ‘power, office, rulership; one having authority, ruler, staff, rod’. It is questionable, however, if a translator from Aramaic to Hebrew would naturally render דמונ שחל by נון שחל, i.e. a broad term translated by a more precise one, unless aware of the historical situation alluded to. In contrast, the Peshitta’s use of a general term to translate a precise one, as also the Targum in Zech 9:8, is conceivable if a better did not come readily to mind. Though the text of the Peshitta is close to MT relative to other versions like OG and the Vulgate, its sense is changed by a conjunction, so that it means ‘one who causes to pass away authority and splendour of kingdoms’.

---

47 Montgomery, ibid, who translated ‘an exactor for royal glory’ without justifying it grammatically.
48 Thus Taylor, *The Peshitta*, 284. He notes the differences between MT and the Peshitta, describing them as ‘transformation’ of MT, implying deliberate change by the Syriac translator; cf 265, 285.
Zimmermann did not consider the OG reading, which represents a considerable difference from MT. These differences can be explored for evidence of a solution and they need to be studied in the context of the introduction to the verse.

MT
καὶ ἀναστησεται ἐκ την ἐτοιμασιαν αὐτοῦ παραβίαιων πρασσων δοξαν βασιλειας

OG
καὶ ἀναστησεται ἐκ της βίζης αὐτοῦ φυτον βασιλειας εἰς ἀναστασιν, ἄνηρ τυπτων δοξαν βασιλεως

V
et stabit in loco eius vilissimus et indignus decore regio

OG, supported by the Syro-Hexapla, has additional phrases, φυτον βασιλειας and εἰς ἀναστασιν. Its reading ἄνηρ τυπτων, seems to be a variant: Collins says it

49 Charles, A Critical, 295.
50 L&S, 935, Indignus, II, A.
reflects MT\textsuperscript{51} but Montgomery thought a reading של נגע for נגע produced τυπτων.\textsuperscript{52}

The noun ἅνηρ might be implicit in the masculine participle של נגע, in which case it is a pleonastic addition to the translation. More likely it could be the equivalent of MT מנהיר. The nearest form similar to this participle and meaning ‘man’ would be מבר: loss or addition of Yod and Mem must be adduced for this transition, as well as confusion of Ayin and Gimel (an aural error). Of course, Yod could be discounted as an added mater lectionis.

Hebrew של נגנ has, according to KB3, the semantic range ‘spur on, collect, force to work, oppress’ and its participle can mean ‘slave-driver, tyrant’. OG τυπτεῖν is the standard equivalent in LXX for ἄνηρ (but used once for נגנ and once for ἄνηρ\textsuperscript{53}), and, although ‘one who strikes’ may be connected with the concept of oppression, it is not an accurate equivalent for של נגנ. It more probably derives from של נגנ than של נגנ since a defective Shin is more likely to have been mistaken for Ayin than Pe. This must be set in the context of the clause as a whole in order to compare possible Hebrew and Aramaic solutions.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MT, } & \text{מעבידי פענו הוד מלכות [רבים]} \text{ וכנים} \\
\theta > \text{Heb, } & \text{מעביד בניוד הוד מלכות [רבים] \text{ عبر}} \\
\text{OG > Heb, } & \text{נכֶר בניוד הוד מלך [רבים]} \\
\text{S > Heb, } & \text{מעבידי בניוד הוד מלכות [רבים]} \\
\text{V > Heb, } & \text{עביד בניוד הוד מלכות [רבים]}
\end{align*}
\]

\textsuperscript{51} Collins, Daniel, 366.

\textsuperscript{52} Montgomery, A Critical, 145.

\textsuperscript{53} τυπτεῖν is used in LXX for ἄνηρ Hiphil in Isa 41:7, and for ἄνηρ in Ex 8:2 (7:27).
The confusion between מִלְכָּה of MT and מִלְכַּר of the OG Hebrew equivalent is best elucidated in Aramaic where the Vav provides a Vav to be confused with Vav in מִלְכָּה: in Hebrew ... of could be confused with ... The solution is simpler in Aramaic. The plural in the Peshitta reflects a Hebrew confusion between מִלְכָּה and מִלְכָּר, but it could also be an Aramaic discrepancy between מִלְכָּר and מִלְכָּר. That the noun is indefinite is a problem in all the above texts (except the Syro-Hexapla). Certainly He of the definite article could have fallen out of a Hebrew text before a ligature of Resh and Dalet, or as a result of some general confusion in with the term מִלְכָּר; in Aramaic similarly Tav and He of מִלְכָּר may have been lost in confusion with the letters ... following, and possibly even an emphatic ending with Aleph.

OG τῆς ῥίζης in v 20 seems to reflect use of בַּנָּ י in MT with the meaning ‘stock’.\(^{54}\)

In v 7 Aramaic מְעָרַב נֶעַבְדָה was the suggested source of both שָׁרש and בַּנָּ י in MT, leading to use of ῥίζη in OG. Collins assumes v 20 has been influenced by v 7, and OG was understood to be conflate with v 7 by Montgomery.\(^{55}\) The word order in OG is reversed between 11:7, φυτὸν ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης αὐτοῦ, and 11:20, ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης αὐτοῦ φυτὸν βασιλείας, but if the latter is an addition of the translator influenced by v 7, it is not identical, for φυτὸν modified by the genitive βασιλείας ends the

\(^{54}\) Cf page 262.
phrase. Since יַעֲנוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל makes good sense as ‘in his place, office’, there must be some reason why OG reads ἐκ τῆς ρίζης αὑτοῦ φυτον. There may have been conflation of two meanings of בַּן, if both ‘root’ and ‘shoot’ or ‘offspring’ are considered synonyms of ‘stock’; but φυτον, ‘plant, what has grown, tree, creature, descendant’, is not quite right as a translation of בַּן. It also lacks a pronoun equivalent of the Hebrew third masculine singular suffix, and a preposition.

OG has two words from αὐτῷ ἀναστησάται and this may indicate conflation of two clauses, each the equivalent of MT.

**MT**

נתמר על בַּן מתעביר וגו נגש הダー מﻠְכוֹת

**OG**

βασιλείας φυτον καὶ ἀναστησάται ἐκ τῆς ρίζης αὐτοῦ

**MT**

נתמר על בַּן מתעביר נגש הדר מﻠְכוֹת

**OG**

δοζάν βασιλείας τυπτῶν ἀνὴρ εἰς ἀναστασίν

It is unclear if there is an equivalent for OG φυτον in MT. Neither is there any obvious way of accounting for the loss or accretion of Hebrew words in either of the two clauses. Some explanation is needed for change between בַּן and בֶן, equivalent of Greek ἐκ, as well as lack of equivalent for רְדוּ in the first Greek clause.

Montgomery thought that βασιλείας was a corrective gloss on βασιλείας, that εἰς ἀναστασίν was the equivalent of לְעַנֵּהוּ (without explaining whether this derives from לְעַנֵּהוּ or מְעַבִּר, where CG reads מִקְמוֹד) and that τυπτῶν came from Hebrew עֲנָה. Charles retroverted the second clause in OG thus:58

---

56 See BHS, note 20a.
57 Montgomery, cf note 52.
58 See Charles, 1929, 295 for this retroversion.
On the basis of Charles’ suggestions, but using דבר instead of שֵׁם, MT and OG could be compared thus:

MT

בְּעֵשׁ על כָּנָה מעֵבָרָהּ וּנְהַג הָרַד מֶלֶךְ

OG > Heb

בְּעֵשׁ על כָּנָה מֶלֶךְ וּנְהַג הָרַד מֶלֶךְ

There is no easy way to account for the readings in terms of mechanical Hebrew errors, except for Montgomery’s assessment of מֶלֶךְ as alternative for מֶלֶךְ.

Semantic ranges in the vocabulary employed in MT and OG must be compared carefully.

Hebrew:

ךָ נָּמַס: from root דָּבָר, place, position, office; shoot, root, stock
from root דָּבָר, stand, base, pedestal

עֵבָר Hiphil: cause to pass over, bring over; allow to pass, overlook;
make over, dedicate, present offerings; cause to pass away, take away, remove

נָּמַס Qal: spur on, press, drive, oppress, exact, collect;
participle = slave-driver, bailiff, tyrant

Greek:

飔υτον: plant, garden plant; sucker; creature; offspring

---

59 KB3, cf page 261 and footnote 33 above, gives ‘shoot’ as one meaning of כ, but it is not clear if there is support for this correspondence apart from φυτον in OG of Dan 11:20.
This comparison confirms there is no clear semantic link between ἀναστασίς and לָעֵב, there being only ‘shoot’ and ‘sucker’ in common. As observed before, τυπτείν is not a direct equivalent of לָעֵב. Montgomery and Charles naturally assumed that εἰς ἀναστασίς represented some Hebrew variant such as לָעֵב, since the Greek noun can mean ‘rising / setting up’, but the preposition is not easy to explain mechanically, since Lamed is the most distinctive of Hebrew consonants. Likewise, if it is an alternative to the first verb, לָעֵב, the preposition is a problem. Besides its obvious links with root לָעֵב, ἀναστασίς can compare semantically with לָעֵב through the idea of ‘removal’. If ἀναστασίν carried this meaning, it could derive in some way from לָעֵב and there would be no need to posit an alternative reading לָעֵב (as in the CG reading) or לָעֵב, but MT לָעֵב has no preposition. ἀναστασίς even has a link with לָעֵב in its meaning of ‘stand’ (which derives from לָעֵב to ‘be firm’ or to ‘establish’60), since it can mean ‘setting up’. Since לָעֵב is the only word in MT to carry a preposition, it is most probable that εἰς ἀναστασίς is an alternative translation for this noun, though the lack of genitive pronoun is still a problem.

None of the Hebrew alternatives gives a completely satisfactory explanation for the differences between MT and OG in this part of 11:20.

60 Ibid. for divergences in the lexicons concerning the roots for לָעֵב.
Retroversion to Aramaic of MT and OG texts could be:

MT > Aram יָרֹקְם על נָצָבָה מְצַבֵּר נֶשׁ הָדוֹר מְלָל

OG¹ > Aram יָרֹקְם מִן نָצָבָה מְצַבֵּר מְלָל

OG² > Aram על נָצָבָה מְצַבֵּר מְלָל

Apart from a similar explanation for the presence or lack of נֶשׁ as noted in 11:7,⁶¹ there is little to recommend this retroversion as a solution above any found in Hebrew. נָצָבָה could represent a partial reduplication of נַצָּבָה, but the graphic likeness of נֶשׁ and מָחָה is very remote.

However, the question concerning the equivalent of OG εἰς ἀναστασίαν is illuminated. Just as Hebrew לְעַמֵּר is unlikely to be the answer, Aramaic infinitive לָמָּכֵּה is improbable as a solution. Εἰς ἀναστασίαν, being a substantive governed by a preposition, only has an equivalent in the Hebrew in על נֶבֶּל, which has been retroverted to Aramaic על נָצָבָה. The Greek word is not an exact semantic match with either the Hebrew or Aramaic, but it seems to be closer to the latter. נֶבֶל can mean ‘stand, place, office’, but not ‘standing, setting up’, though the root נָבֵל can mean to ‘be upright’. נָצָבָה, however, can mean ‘planting’ and, since its root נָצַב has the sense to ‘set up’ in Aramaic, also ‘setting up’. Moreover the lack of genitive pronoun can be explicated by the Aramaic suffix in He, which may be an emphatic ending or a genitive pronoun suffix. That is נָצָבָה could be translated by either נֶבֶּל or ἀναστασίας.

The differences in prepositions in all the texts concerned must be addressed. Whilst variation of a preposition may represent a problem in mechanical terms in a Hebrew text, this is not so much a difficulty where translation is concerned because there can be great fluidity of meaning for prepositions, and formal equivalents would not
necessarily be employed. Here in Dan 11:20, in the context of a royal successor, the most natural preposition to accompany נְצַבְתָּה would be וְּ in the OG וּל in the phrase נְצַבְתָּה וְּ seems to mean ‘on’ (his root / stock) and in this context could be a dynamic equivalent of וְּ, and, since the reverse is also possible, וְּ could be the dynamic equivalent of נְצַבְתָּה. פָּזַ ע, on the other hand, is difficult to construe except as a translation of the preposition ל, unless the whole Greek phrase פָּזַ ע is a dynamic idiom for נְצַבְתָּה וְּ. In v 7 the Aramaic phrase נְצַבְתָּה וְּ was the solution to a conflate text. If the same expression was used in v 20, then OG וְּ פָּזַ ע would be a fairly literal rendering of it and פָּזַ ע might be a dynamic alternative.

The substantial problems in this verse still remain unexplained by the above retroversion to Aramaic. A more helpful line of investigation is provided by a suggestion of Charles which was not concerned with the OG at all. He retroverted the Peshitta’s וְּ פָּזַ ע into Hebrew וְּ פָּזַ ע, presumably on the basis of common meanings, ‘force, power’. 62 Without mater lectionis, this could easily be confused with פָּזַ ע, ‘seed, offspring’, which could in its turn be the source of OG פָּזַ ע. This equivalence is found in Ezek 17:5, where MT פָּזַ ע is rendered in LXX as פָּזַ ע to פָּזַ ע פָּזַ ע. The corollary of this is that פָּזַ ע should be connected to פָּזַ ע in MT, but the link between פָּזַ ע and פָּזַ ע is not semantically direct (being similar to that between פָּזַ ע and וְּ). A mechanical error is not totally impossible if Ayin was in some way corrupted into Shin and each of the consonants in פָּזַ ע with vertical strokes was changed into the appropriate one in פָּזַ ע; but this is not highly probable.

61 Cf page 260.
62 Charles, cf page 273 note 58.
63 HRp 1447 does not record this as a direct equivalence for פָּזַ ע, but lists it as problematic. Yet it seems to be a literal rendering in the Greek of a difficult Hebrew phrase.
Exploration of the connection between ‘arm, power, force’ and ‘seed, offspring’ in Aramaic produces the clearest link between OG and MT in this verse. There could have been confusion involving רוח, ‘arm, power’ and נוף, ‘seed, offspring’, a simple error between ר and נ, leading to OG having רוח in its Hebrew manuscript.64

There are three verbs in Aramaic which could be associated with רוח, and with each other, by graphic error. (The last two of these occur in Hebrew, but not the first, and not in MT.)

- וַדְרַע to ‘carry away, lift’
- וַדְרַע to ‘rebel, chastise, subjugate, drive, rule’
- וַדְרַע to ‘stamp, beat’.

Of these, וַדְרַע is clearly the semantic equivalent of Hebrew נַפֶּשׁ, and וַדְרַע matches the meaning of ἁπάλαζον. וַדְרַע relates to נֵפֶשׁ through the sense ‘remove/removal’. Before retroversion can be attempted the issue of the form of the Lamed-Aleph participle must be addressed.

BA employs Lamed-Aleph participial forms with Aleph but other Jewish Aramaic uses Yod. QA evidences both, as e.g. in the Genesis Apocryphon.65 The forms with Yod will be employed in retroversion, but they are not essential to the analysis because original forms with Aleph could have been copied later with Yod: this could have been an aural transition or a deliberate change of orthographic style. If נַפֶּשׁ was

---

64 It is improbable that Jewish Aramaic had the form נַפֶּשׁ, ‘seed’: it is listed in Ja Vol 1, 324, but does not occur in BA, where the only example, in Dan 2:43, reads נַפֶּשׁ. The Genesis Apocryphon has נַפֶּשׁ; cf 2:15; 21:10, 12, 13, 14. BCTP lists two occasions in 1 Sam 2:31 where the Targum has נַפֶּשׁ and MT reads נַפֶּשׁ, but the context requires the sense ‘offspring’ and LXX reads ὀπλησµα σοῦ. The meturgeman read the same pointing for the Hebrew as MT, and BCTP is inaccurate to give the meaning of נַפֶּשׁ as ‘seed’ on the basis of this text. Sokoloff lists only נַפֶּשׁ for ‘seed’. Here in Dan 11:20 the distinct forms נַפֶּשׁ, ‘arm’ and נַפֶּשׁ, ‘seed’, may have been confused in Aramaic.

65 Cf Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 213, for an index to Lamed-Aleph forms. Note e.g. 2:2 32, 22:3 בְּנֵן, where the last two listed could be perfects or participles, but each shows the later morphology.
in an original text, the transition could have been from Ayin to Yod, without forms using Aleph.66

Retroversions to Aramaic using the above verbs could be as follows.

MT > Aram  יקוטא מְצַבַּת דַּיְרֵי חוֹרֵד מֶלֶךְ
OG¹ > Aram  יקוטא מְצַבַּת חוֹרֵד מֶלֶךְ
OG² > Aram  מְצַבַּת דַּיְרֵי חוֹרֵד מֶלֶךְ

S > Aram  יקוטא מְצַבַּת דַּיְרֵי חוֹרֵד מֶלֶךְ, i.e. Heb Vorlage > Aram
V > Aram  יקוטא מְצַבַּת דַּיְרֵי חוֹרֵד מֶלֶךְ, i.e. Heb Vorlage > Aram

Inclusion of genitives with דִּי would further complicate these readings, but they are unnecessary in explanations of most of the variants. There may be several different permutations of a solution to this textual puzzle. One is to assume the shortest text, OG¹, was original and meant ‘and from his stock will arise a royal seed’. If רָעָר was read as דָּיִיר (possibly as דָּיִיר first), this would have resulted in the text:

ימֶלֶךְ, ‘from his stock one who removes a kingdom’.

This could have given rise to alternative or additional readings by dittography thus:

i) דָּיִיר, ‘royal glory’ or ‘glory of a kingdom’; or it became דָּיִיר מֶלֶךְ, ‘a remover of glory of a kingdom’.

ii) דָּיִיר, one who removes’, became דָּיִיר, ‘a subjugator’.

iii) דָּיִיר, became דָּיִיר (כְּפִיךָ דָּיִיר) or דָּיִיר (כְּפִיךָ דָּיִיר), ‘one who strikes’.

66 Another orthographic change which might have been involved in some stages of transmission is use of final He instead of Aleph or Yod. This would be relevant especially to any confusion associated with דָּיִיר, but I have tried to limit the number of variables in the textual models, otherwise the alternatives for sources of confusion proliferate to unmanageable numbers. To put it another way, there are an embarrassingly large number of possible solutions in an Aramaic text here, so the models explored can only ever demonstrate the potential, not exhaust it.
This model takes OG$^1$ as representing the original Semitic text, and allows the possibility that the imprecise הָדְרָא was a secondary development. It also suggests MT is conflate with three different readings: where OG$^1$ has only φυτόν, it has עָלְכֶּבַּר בָּרֶר, equivalents of דֶּרֶךְ and דֶּרֶךְ respectively in Aramaic; cf page 273. OG$^2$ has the same number of elements as MT but evidences some differences in readings: probably מִנְעֶבְר הָבֶר for Hebrew, derived from Aramaic דֶּרֶךְ; υπότον for עָלְכֶּבַּר deriving respectively from דֶּרֶךְ and דֶּרֶךְ in Aramaic; probably μή καὶ ἀναστασίαν for על כָּר or Hebrew variant for this, traceable to Aramaic לָצְבַּח. Here it can be seen that the lack of the definite article with ἀναστασίαν may be due to final He being read as part of נָצְבַּח, leaving a form לָצְבַּח which was read as לָצְבַּח.

In a model with MT representing an original text, which in Aramaic could have been graphically confusing, it seems less likely that OG$^1$ would have developed from haplographies in Aramaic, than that OG as a whole represents a number of alternative readings conflated into a text similar to MT. In this case OG equivalent of MT would be καὶ ἀναστήσαται ἐκ τῆς ρίζης αὐτοῦ … ἀνὴρ υπότον δόξαν βασιλείας. Into the Vorlage, which differed from MT in ways already noted, was added alternative readings represented by the Greek terms φυτόν, βασιλείας and μή καὶ ἀναστασίας. However, the Vulgate and Peshitta, which have the same elements as MT, use the conjunction in different places and this may be another indication that MT, or more precisely the MT group of texts, is a conflation of alternative readings incorporated into the text in slightly varying ways in different individual manuscripts.

Another model could therefore be deduced from the extant witnesses, guided by the sense provided by the available alternative readings. The sense of OG$^1$, for example, is a tautology, since it is obvious that a descendant of one monarch is of the royal seed. The meaning of MT, though acceptable to many modern scholars in the light of historical events known from other sources, is still awkward: ‘splendour / glory’
is a strange expression to describe taxes demanded from a population. If the temple
treasure was the subject of extortion then the indefinite terms are a problem.

The idea of Charles, that גֶּזֶר may be the source of the Peshitta’s use of מִשְׁתַּחֵץ, and
the graphic link this provided with מְזָר, ‘seed’, in Aramaic, and with OG φυτοῦ, led
to the discovery that the meanings of three words in the MT could be traced to
Aramaic verbs with the common elements Resh and Dalet. Given the ease with
which these two consonants could be confused, it seems very probable that Aramaic
textual corruption lies behind this section of Daniel. It is the more likely because
these same graphemes occur in the problematic word דִּיוֹן, which could have been
carried directly from an Aramaic text into a Hebrew, but which could only have
developed from textual error in Aramaic. The Aramaic elements adduced thus far,
from which Hebrew and then Greek text sprang, are:

Aram מִשְׁתַּחֵץ מִשְׁחַטּ הָדָר וְדוֹר מֶלךְ
MT מִשְׁחַטּ אוּתְנֶה מִשְׁחַטּ הָדָר מֶלךְ
OG βασιλείως δοξαν ἀνήρ ἐκ τῆς βίζης αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστησεται
bασιλείας εἰς ἀναστασιν

Aram דִּיוֹן
OG θυμιστοῦ φυτοῦ

These Aramaic elements illustrate the potential for textual error in that language, as
the most likely forms to have facilitated the errors. Other complications could have
been changes between verbal orthographies, as e.g. קֵדֶר / רָדָר / רָדָר, and more
frequent use of the genitive particle דִּי.

67 Cf Montgomery, A Critical, 444-5.
68 If this should be doubted at all in this context, attention is drawn toJa, Vol 1, 320 and Vol 2, 1451,
where the form קִדֶר is assumed to be a transposition of קֵדֶר in Pes 56, though the sense is
different from the one here.
69 The form קֵדֶר is used in Targ Isa 57:3 for MT וּרְדָר: this is a paraphrase, קַנָּן, ‘generation’, for
Before attempting another model solution, the issue of the source of φυτον must be further discussed. So far it has been assumed that this represents בְּרִית in a Semitic text, because it overlaps with its semantic range in the meaning ‘offspring’. However, in LXX as a whole it is not used in this way, for it occurs there only five times, and more than once only for ἰῶθ.

φυτεῦν also is used predominantly for בְּרִית and so it is possible that φυτον is used in the sense ‘planting’ and is therefore another alternative to בְּרִית, going back to Aramaic לְצֹבִית which can mean ‘planting’. Its semantic use in LXX as a whole would support this correspondence.

Against it is use of φυτον in Dan 11:7 for בְּרִית, in a section where לְצֹבִית has also been traced as the Aramaic behind בְּרִית and OG τῆς ῥιζῆς. In this light, it seems unlikely that φυτον would be an alternative for ῥιζῆς, the more so because it is not in the genitive case governed by ἐκ. On the other hand, its case ending would allow it to be a misplaced alternative to ἀναστασίαν which is governed by ἐκ, and which could also be traced to Aramaic לְצֹבִית. This would mean OG would have three different readings, where MT has one בְּרִית, which can be accounted for in one Aramaic term. It would also mean that בְּרִית could be discounted as part of the textual equation. On balance, it is best to assume the Greek translator of Daniel ch 11 was consistent and used the word to mean ‘offspring’, or similar, as in v 7, thus maintaining בְּרִית as part of the solution.

70 HRp 1447 supplies φυτον for πετσεστι in Ezek 31:4; 34:29; לְצֹבִית in Dan 11:7; סְבָב in Gen 22:13 and בּוֹרַה in 3 Kgs 19:5.

71 HRp 1446-7: likewise φυτεύεται and φυτεύεται occur for words of root בְּרִית.

72 This equivalence is found in a restored text of Εν 1f (10:16), and בְּרִית and φυτεῦν are equivalents in Εν 1g (10:19) according to Loren T Stuckenbruck in pp 31, 47 of ‘Revision of Aramaic-Greek and Greek-Aramaic Glossaries in “The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4” by J. T. Milik’, JJS 41 (1990), 13-48.

73 Cf pages 262, 272.
A third model could begin with the Aramaic verb דרי as providing a sensible reading, ‘and there will arise from his stock one who subjugates a / the kingdom’. This is most easily expressed diagrammatically, where C = conflation:

Marginal notes on the different readings and conflation could have produced extant readings either at the Aramaic stage, or after translation into Hebrew. The translation itself could have produced a marginal note, on the alternative rendering of the ambiguous מַטֶּה, which gave rise to OG אֶזֶף אִנָּסַסְסָסָס, and אֵין in OG would derive from a Hebrew error of בַּבַּר for

It would be fatuous to claim that this model represents the actual sequence of textual development. If the conjunctions in the Vulgate and Peshitta are testimony to conflation, they show that the process varied in different manuscripts. It only serves to illustrate the complexity of the textual history, and no doubt many other models could be constructed on the foundation of different ‘original’ texts.

All this seems a long way from Zimmermann’s original idea that נָגַש in MT derives from נַגְשָׁן in Aramaic. Though his instincts in assuming an Aramaic term behind
the Hebrew seem justified, the evidence of OG suggests that the solution is far more complex than his simple correlation.

12:2 MT רָדָנְתָּה
θ ἐν γῆς χωματι
V in terrae pulvere

OG ἐν τῷ πλατεί τῆς γῆς
Syh רדנתה סַלְפָּה (check)

S רדנעה

raudnah was traced by Zimmermann to Aramaic עָרָא, meaning ‘beneath’ in this phrase, which a Hebrew translator had erroneously understood with the sense, ‘ground’. Although he was correct in stating that קַעְרָא was sometimes the equivalent for רָדָנְתָּה in targums, as BCTP bears out, his explanation for this unusual Hebrew assumes the translator misunderstood the Aramaic. It is just as probable that a translator thought רדנעה could be used as a preposition, like עָרָא; i.e., רדנעה would be a calque of Aramaic עָרָא in its sense, ‘beneath’. However, since standard equivalent of קַעְרָא is יָרָא, it is more likely that this Hebrew would have been employed in such a calque, though the translator could have been influenced by knowledge of Gen 3:19. If רדנעה is a calque of עָרָא, it cannot be used as evidence of a written Aramaic Vorlage.

Although Zimmermann’s original idea could be right, there is no precedence for the expression ‘under the dust’ to indicate the abode of the dead in MT. The nearest similar phrase is in Deut 4:18 בָּעָרָא וּמַעֲשֶׁה לְאָלָם which is hardly relevant to this context.
The unique phrase in MT caused some problems for the Versions. θ and V appear to support MT, but the terms are reversed in OG and Syh to give the sense ‘the breadth of the earth’, though the Greek term πλατας ( also πλατης or πλατος ) can mean a platform on which a tomb was placed. The Peshitta, as often, has a shorter text, which may reflect the translator’s habit of giving a smoother reading. Although the import of the phrase is clear, a reference to some of the dead, the exact rendering is problematic, particularly in OG. Commentators have agreed that the expression is strange, and various Hebrew solutions have been suggested.

1) Bevan noted the suggestion of Robertson Smith that the term נושם in Ps 49:12 may be a corruption of נשמות, meaning ‘cairns’ from an Arabic cognate term, and he thought the reading in Daniel could have been ריעת עפר. He conceded, however, that this word for ‘cairns’ was not extant in Aramaic or Hebrew. Whether such a term ( in the singular ) could be posited for the reading ת��י πλατει in OG is difficult to say, but the LXX equivalent of γη for עפר found in Gen 3:14, 19 is employed in the same context of death.

2) Talmon has suggested a Hebrew couplet since the terms עפר and נושם are interchangeable. He noted that Ibn Ezra’s quotation of this verse lacks נושם, though he admitted that it could be a free quotation. The two terms used together in Gen 3:19 are both connected with the world of the dead; cf Ps 146:4; Job 20:11, and sleep itself is a euphemism for death in Jer 51:39, 57; Job 14:12. So the use of both words here might indicate a conflation of two different readings with the same meaning. McLay, however, thought that the evidence pointed to both terms in the Hebrew manuscripts of OG and θ readings since they each had two words, like MT. The Vulgate also supports this view, but not the Peshitta.

---

74 L. S., Vol 2, 1413. McLay, The OG and Th, 198, read OG πλατος as a dynamic equivalent for נושם but found θ’s use of χωμα, ‘earth’, to be distinctive.
3) Montgomery thought עפר might carry a meaning it has in later Hebrew of ‘matter’, Greek ἄμμος, so that the phrase could have the sense ‘material ground’. The full phrase would mean ‘some sleepers of the material ground’. This seems hardly more acceptable than ‘some sleepers of the dusty ground’.77

4) KB3 notes that, as in Gen 4:10, Num 16:30, 32; 26:10 and Deut 11:6, אֲדָמָה is a general Hebrew term for the underworld, but also sees a parallel expression here with the Babylonian bit epri and would translate ‘land of dust’,78 but no further attestation in Hebrew is given.

None of these explanations seems conclusive, and none explains the reversal of the terms in OG which must therefore be counted a dynamic rendering.

An explanation in Aramaic which is graphic in nature is provided along the lines of ינ in Symmachus of 11:2. If the Aramaic was similar to the genitive construction in MT Isa 26:19, שְׁכַנֵי עֵפֶר, דִּמְלָא עֵפֶר, it could have been יָדָא עֵפֶר, לֶכֶר עֵפֶר. Ayin of עֵפֶר caused a reading of Yod as Ayin. The original expression would have been similar to Isaiah’s, with replacement of ‘dwellers’ by ‘sleepers’. It is not impossible that the shorter Peshitta reading, and even Ibn Ezra’s, represent a Hebrew Vorlage that, more accurately than MT, reflects an original Aramaic text, although the putative error in MT could have been recognised and corrected at some stage of translation or copying.

The textual study has not upheld most of Zimmermann’s evidence which has been found to be mainly semantic. It has supported his view of נַחֲרָא in 8:23, and Ginsberg’s view of ‘his army’ in 11:7, and it has brought to light other textual evidence of an Aramaic Vorlage which will be collated in the final chapter.

77 Cf Cl, Vol 1, 130-1.
78 KB3, Vol 1, 15, where LXX, Θ and V are also translated here, ‘dust of the earth’.
Chapter Seven

Further Samples for Investigation by Textual Analysis

This expression in Daniel surprises the reader, because the more familiar idiom ‘heat of his anger’ is expected. The expression is found in 1QIsa\(^a\) 42:25; 66:15. Syntactically similar expressions with רומח in MT Isa 42:25; 66:15. Syntactically similar expressions with רומח are in MT ורומח Lev 26:28; Ezek 3:14. רומח occurs in sequences of synonyms, with יא in Jer 44:6; Ezek 23:25; 38:18, and with יא and י فمن in Deut 29:27; Jer 21:5; 32:37.\(^1\)

Both KB3 and CI allow that רומח can sometimes mean ‘violence’\(^2\) and this could be the sense here, especially if the substantive is translated adjectivally, ‘in his violent anger’; but this syntax could also be applied to the common meanings of רומח to give the sense ‘in his powerful / vehement anger’. If this is the true meaning, then the phrase is still unique. All the Versions, with the exception of the Peshitta, seem to have rendered a syntactically formal equivalent to MT by using a genitive construction.

---

\(^1\) The common phrase in the three references is יא רומח ופקוקת 컴퓨터, with the addition of two pronominal suffixes in Jer 32:37.

4QDan\textsuperscript{b} confirms the MT reading רְבָּע, as do all the Versions except for OG ἔν τῷ μῷ ὀργής which employs two synonyms and lacks a pronoun equivalent of the Hebrew suffix. The noun ὀργή has no semantic overlap with רְבָּע and if OG had the same text as MT, this must be considered a dynamic translation, or even a loose one.\textsuperscript{3} In addition, the pronoun suffix was lacking in its Vorlage. Clearly the suffix in Hebrew could have been lost or gained by confusion with the conjunctive Vav which follows in רְבָּע, but there is no obvious textual solution to the difference in meaning between רְבָּע and ὀργής.

Greek ὀργή has the semantic range, ‘temperament, disposition, mood, anger, passion’.\textsuperscript{4} None of these meanings overlaps with any of רְבָּע which means ‘firmness, power, strength, force, vehemence’.\textsuperscript{5} HP indicates that LXX usually uses ὀργή for ἀμέν, ἀμμός, or ἄρα, and that in the phrase ἔν τῷ μῷ ὀργής the latter is used for ἄρα, ἀμμός and ἀμμός.\textsuperscript{6} This supports the semantic range indicated in LS.

The Aramaic expression equivalent to OG is found in 1Q20 1.12, רְבָּע תַּתַּת הָעַר, which, apart from the suffix, gives the same sense as ἔν τῷ μῷ ὀργής. Is there a term in Aramaic which has the same meaning as Hebrew רְבָּע and which could be confused textually with רְבָּע? Ja lists הַעַר with the sense ‘strength, foundation’, but the only example he supplies with this meaning should probably be translated ‘secret’.\textsuperscript{7} A better alternative is רַמְנָץ from root רָמַן, to ‘be strong, hard’. Ja Vol 2, 1465 lists this with the semantic range ‘strong, vehement; force’ and for the meaning ‘force’ cites

\textsuperscript{3} Contra Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 52-3, note 41, who considers OG an accurate translation. HRp 1009, does not give רְבָּע as an equivalent of ὀργή, but lists its use in Dan LXX 8:6 with an obelus to denote tentative connection between the Hebrew and Greek at best. McLay, The OG and Th, 137-8, section 1.28, 115-MT, and note 41, does not address this difficult translation, but supplies a survey of the Greek terms for ‘anger’ in OG and Theodotion of Daniel.

\textsuperscript{4} LS, Vol 2, 1246.

\textsuperscript{5} BDB, 470-1; KB3, Vol 2, 468.

\textsuperscript{6} HRp, 1008-10.

\textsuperscript{7} The example is Sanhedrin 42b which Ja translates ‘those engaged in the foundation of the world (administration of justice)...’; Ja Vol II 1464. The Soncino translation is ‘those who are engaged in [unravelling] the secrets of the world’; I Epstein (ed.), The
Sanhedrin 45b מְדַרְכָּא which the Soncino edition renders ‘with force’. 8 Retroversion using this Aramaic noun would produce the following phrases:

MT > Aram  תְּפָשׁוֹת חֲדָוֵית
OG > Aram  לְמַחְמָה רְבֵּי חֲדָוֵית
OG > Aram + suffix  תְּפָשׂוֹת חֲדָוֵית

It can be seen that confusion in Aramaic is possible if contamination with Vav and Het of the verb following is considered. Gimel, however is not an easy consonant to mistake for others unless written defectively: but with the left-hand stroke obliterated in some way, it could be mistaken for Zayin. 9 Zayin itself would have been easily confused with Vav or Yod, but this would have occurred in a later script than the one in which confusion between Ayin and Yod occurred, or in a non-archaising script. 10

Another solution in Aramaic is suggested by the use of תקף, ‘strong’ to mean ‘great’; e.g. in 1QGenAp 2:8 there is the expression בְּחַלְלַיְת תקף, ‘with great vehemence’. 11 If a similar expression was in Daniel, תקף בְּחַמָּת תקף or תקף בְּחַמָּת תקף, ‘with great anger’, and if the vowel letter was not added correctly, it may have appeared as two nouns in a genitive construction תקף בְּחַמָּת, in the heat / anger of power. The suffix of the MT may in this case have been a later development in Hebrew, and OG may represent the original.

8 Epstein, Seder Nezikin, 196: the context is that of a large stone dropped with force in judicial stoning of a victim.
9 Cf Birnbaum, ‘Hebrew’ Pt 1, 127; Naveh, The Development, Figure 9; Cross, ‘The Development’, 137, figure 1, especially lines 1, 2, 4, 5. Gimel and He could cause confusion, especially if ligature of Resh and Gimel was involved, but this would include metathesis in one of the above words.
10 Ibid.
as previously noted, is normally associated with the land of Palestine after its usage in Jer 3:19; Ezek 20:6, 15, even though here in Daniel it follows two compass directions. The reading in MT is not accepted as original by all scholars.

Most manuscripts of Theodotion lack πρὸς ἀνατολὴν, but it is supplied in some Lucianic texts. The variety in the compass points listed, from θ with only τον νοτον, to OG μεσημβριαν, ἀνατολας and βορραν, where the Peshitta and Vulgate have the same two as MT, suggests some confusion in the text. This is underlined by the lack of support for MT ἀνατολὴν, where OG appears to have read ἐν αὐτῷ, and θ, followed by Jerome, is usually assumed to have read ἀνατολὴν. Jeansonne has explained the OG reading as a Hebrew corruption from לְבָנָן to לְבָנָן or לְבָנָן, and this seems a reasonable enough assumption. If the Peshitta’s lack of any equivalent for לְבָנָן is taken as evidence of the original Semitic text, then לְבָנָן

---

12 Chapter One, page 39.
must be an addition to the Hebrew. Yet it is perhaps more likely that the Syriac translator omitted an equivalent of the difficult word in the Vorlage.

An Aramaic solution to this problem would need to account for a confusion between words with the same semantic ranges as יִבְנָא and יְבִנה (עֲקָדָה). Aramaic for ‘north’, יִבְנָא, has little in common semantically or graphically with any other Aramaic term which might mean ‘gazelle, honour, beauty’. The same may be said for יִבְרֶה attested in QA.16

So Jeansonne’s suggestion is the only solution regarding a mechanical error in Hebrew. However, it is difficult to accept as coincidence that here are apparently alternative readings יִבְנָא and יְבִנה in Daniel when two similar forms occur in close proximity in Ezek 7:20-22. Moreover, in Ezekiel the Targum takes both words as referring to the Temple at Jerusalem, translating יִבְרֶה by תִּבְרֶה and יְבִנה by תִּבְרֶה.17 These observations complicate any understanding of the terms in Daniel, for there may be an element of intertextuality with these verses in Ezekiel where sacking and profaning of the Temple is the subject, which features as an important theme in Daniel as well.18

The semantic range of the Hebrew words involved are as follows:

- יִבְנָא: gazelle; beauty, honour, ornament, splendour19
- יְבִנה: north, (Mt) Zaphon20
- יִבְרֶה: hide, keep, save up, store; to treasure up, cherish?21

---

16 This is found in EnAstr 285:6: see Greenfield & Sokoloff, ‘The Contribution of Aramaic to the Aramaic Vocabulary’, SQA, 78-97 (86).
18 For the imagery of the bird of prey behind 9:27 with reference to the sacking of the Temple, see pages 229, 235: spoiling of the Temple is also described in Ezek 7:20-22.
19 BDB, 840; KB3, Vol 3, 997-8 where the word is listed under roots I and II
20 BDB, 860; KB3, Vol 3, 1046-7
21 BDB, ibid. KB3, Vol 3, 1049.
The word יִֽרְכַּב in Daniel 8:9 is usually translated ‘the beautiful / glorious land’. A reading דָּוָּאָלֶת in Hebrew would easily account for the OG reading in 8:9. The term כַּפְרוֹנִי in Ezek 7:22 has been translated ‘my treasured / hidden (place)’. Although the Targum makes reference to יִֽרְכַּב, the referent in MT of Ezekiel is more likely to be the Temple itself as Cooke suggests: Wevers understands יִֽרְכַּב as the Holy of Holies, the ‘hidden’ precinct where the presence of Yahweh resided. “OY may also be used of the Temple as the place honoured or beautified by the presence of Yahweh in which case in 11:16, 41, 45 the expressions may refer to the land or mountain honoured with the Temple, i.e. Mount Zion. If יִֽרְכַּב and refer to the Temple, confusion between consonantal homographs יִֽרְכַּב and יִֽרְכַּב must be a serious possibility in the OG Vorlage of Dan 8:9. A deliberate pun may have been intended, which would take the reader or listener by surprise, for the compass point would naturally be expected.

Moreover, this confusion of homographs can explicate two well-known puzzling references to the north where the general subject under discussion is the Temple. In Ps 48:3 יִֽרְכַּב could reflect this word play, since יִֽרְכַּב can mean ‘innermost part, recess, depth’, as well as ‘extreme, remote part’; cf BDB 438; Cl Vol 4, 299. The psalm celebrates Mt Zion as the dwelling place of Yahweh and a double pun could be intended with the regular expression for ‘far north’ or ‘remote parts of

---

22 See e.g. NRSV, NIV for the former: Charles, A Critical, 203; Collins, Daniel, 325 for the latter.
24 Cooke, ibid., contra Greenberg, ibid., who follows the Targum and suggests that the feminine suffixes following in v 22 indicate that the land is implied in the term. Cf W Zimmerli, Ezechiel, Vol I: Ezechiel 1-24, (Neukirchen, Neukirchen Verlag), 159, 164-5; BDB 860. KB3, Vol 3, 1049, follows Zimmerli.
26 In Ezek 16:14 we read יִֽרְכַּב, where in the allegory יִֽרְכַּב is the glory of Yahweh (in the Temple): cf Isa 35:2b for a parallel with יִֽרְכַּב. In 7.20 יִֽרְכַּב, ‘the beauty of his adornment’, speaks of Yahweh’s Temple of which the people are so proud but which they have defiled with abominations.
27 If Theodotion exhibits the original, the effect might have been more stark,expecting a reference to the north after the south. Historically Antiochus IV did sack the Temple on his return from Egypt.
Zaphon'. If we can read נקهة-צומח as referring to the Temple inner rooms not seen by the ordinary worshipper, this supports Wevers’ view of צומח in Ezek 7:22.

The same word-play could elucidate Zech 6:8b where, according to MT, Yahweh says the visionary riders who go forth to the land of the north, מסרה-דיאון. The whole import of the early chapters of this prophetic book is the return of Yahweh to dwell in Judah; cf 2:10-12; and the rebuilding of the Temple; cf 6:9-15; 8:1-3. If the expression in Zechariah was מסרה-צומח, where צומח means the Temple precincts, this would be the equivalent of Targ Ezek 7:22 ארץ בוית ישנים. The import of Zech 6:8 would be that the impetus to rebuild the Temple (where his spirit would rest) had come from a northern land.28

This suggests that the mechanical error in Hebrew as outlined by Jeansonne is not the solution, but "OY may be a replacement for צומח, removing the ambiguity in the form צומח, with an alternative closely associated term, referring to the Temple.

There seems little prospect of a mechanical confusion in Aramaic, i.e. between different expressions for the Temple or its site, or even the land and the word יבך, ‘gazelle’, or ‘north’. Its emphatic form יבך is consonantally the same as the emphatic form of יב which can mean ‘precious’ (i.e. ‘treasured’), so that this might provide for Hebrew translations צומח or מסרהו. However, the term יב in Aramaic does not appear to have the abstract sense of its Hebrew cognate, though it could have been used thus as a Hebraism. Again יבך, for which the only graphic similarity might be between לברך and לברך adduced for 9:27 כות / ερυθ, does not have

---

potential for a superior solution. None of this provides a sound basis for positing an Aramaic Vorlage.

An alternative explanation in Aramaic might be found in the form מַצָּר. This could be read as the emphatic form of the noun, מַצָּר, which means ‘honour’, or as its adjectival homonym which means ‘precious, honoured’. The ambiguous form could have given rise to either Hebrew word הָאַזֵּר or its adjectival homonym in translation. Common Aramaic roots meaning ‘hidden’ according to BCTP are סְתָר and טֺוְר. The first would provide an equivalent to מַצָּר of הָאַזֵּר which might be confused with סְתָר, ‘the gazelle’, but there is not much potential for a solution with סְתָר.

The evidence of the use of הָאַזֵּר elsewhere in Daniel must also be considered in the light of the many variants in the Versions: this involves examining the three other occurrences in 11:16, 41, 45.

continued...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11:16</th>
<th>11:41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT, 4QDan</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in terra inclita</td>
<td>in terram gloriosam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oγ</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Συρ</td>
<td>Σν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σαβησι</td>
<td>σαβησι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in terra fortitudinis</td>
<td>in terram sabai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch 11:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Here, Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 202 restores σαβησι, and in 11:41, 45 σαβησιν.
30 Ziegler, ibid., records these additional variants to θ, σαβησι 62, σαβησι 147, 584: to OG σαβησι [-βίν] Ηι: γίνεται θελήσεως Th: anon. τής δύναμεος 233 σ in terra fortitudinis; cf θ, V 8:9. Montgomery, A Critical, 440-1, listed these forms σαβησιν θ Ηι; σαβησι 87, 89; and attributes σαβησι to the Lucianic text.
31 Here 967 is defective, but gives some support, reading γοίν
32 In this verse the entire reading of OG is, καὶ έπελευστάτη εἰς τὴν χώραν μου, a much shorter reading than MT. The Syro-Hexapla supports OG and supplies its equivalent of MT marked with an asterisk; cf Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 208. 967 has a large lacuna from vv 40-42.
33 Taylor, The Peshitta, 267, 285, notes the Peshitta reading οῦνα for ἔλευθερόν: he thinks this was mistaken for ἴδιον, and certainly in some scripts the left stroke of Tsade resembled Nun and this could have led to graphic confusion. On the other hand 'guard, keep' is semantically near to Hebrew ἴδιον, and it is not impossible that the Vorlage of the Peshitta had a form of this verb, but there is no clear indication that it was passive like ἴδιον in Ezek 7:22.
It has been argued from the use of יָדָעִי (8:9) and the reading יָדָעִי, witnessed to by OG, that the term in MT could apply to the Temple of Jerusalem. In the next two uses, in Dan 11:16, 41, יָדָעִי appears in a phrase which describes the land. It is similarly used in prophetic texts in a variety of contexts: in Isa 13:19 it is used of Babylon; 23:9 of Tyre; 28:1, 4 of Ephraim, the ‘fading flower of the beauty of his glory’, but in v 5 Yahweh will be יָדָעִי יָדָעִי יָדָעִי יָדָעִי; Jer 3:19 of the land of Israel יָדָעִי יָדָעִי יָדָעִי; Ezek 20:6, 15 of Canaan; 25:6 of the border cities of Moab. This being the case, its seems strange that the Greek translators had such a problem with the word in the contexts in Daniel 11.

The Hebrew noun יָדָעִי meaning ‘beauty, splendour, glory’ is traced by the lexicons to the Aramaic root אָדָעִי לֱבָעִי to ‘incline towards, desire’34 and this is evident in the plural form found in Jer 3:19.35 The variety of transcriptions in the texts of Theodotion may derive from different orthographies or spellings of the substantive in Hebrew, based on this root, though they appear to be plurals suggesting Hebrew or Aramaic forms אָדָעִי, אָדָעִי, אָדָעִי, אָדָעִי. OG use of ὅλημιζ may reflect a singular word with Aleph, אָדָעִי. The latter form would also account for variants which suggest אָדָעִי was read,36 though these could easily be contaminations from Theodotion’s reading in 8:9.

The OG meaning, as well as some of the plural forms in Θ manuscripts, could alternatively derive from textual errors. In 11:16 in Hebrew, where Yod is followed by conjunctive Vav, two extra vertical strokes written in error could have been read as Nun and Vav to give the reading יָדָעִי, ‘desire’: without a vowel letter, this would have been יָדָעִי יָדָעִי entail only one extra vertical.

34 Cf KB3, cf page 291, note 19.
36 KB3, ibid.
In 11:41 the plural forms in Theodotion may have developed from a similar extra vertical stroke, to produce the Aramaic form with mater lectionis added later, and, with the addition of ligature, to produce the Hebrew thus:

רבעים רבים / רבעים רבים
/ /
רבעים רבים
/ /
רבעים רבים

The problem is that this does not explain Hebrew masculine plural forms in manuscripts of Theodotion when the plural is feminine in Jer 3:19. There are variations in the plural form of דּוֹרֵשׁ in Dan 11:15, 22 where they are feminine, and 11:31 where it is masculine: similarly we find מָכְרֵיה 37 in 11:15, but masculine plural forms in 11:24, 29. There may be nothing in these variations other than scribal errors, and it is difficult to find any proof of underlying Aramaic in them.

OG has a short reading, and this can be traced to haplography in Hebrew where has become בַּאֲרֵיָּה: potential for confusion lies in the two consonants in common, Bet and Tsade, plus the similarity of He to Aleph in some scripts, or to Resh when the left-hand stroke is missing from He. It is a complicated mistake, involving metathesis, confused consonants, and haplography. There is some potential in Aramaic for a similar error if an equivalent for טֶלֶשׁ is employed,_retroversion to בַּאֲרֵיָּה: might suggest that Resh and Ayin have fallen out, and that Vav was read as Yod to produce the first singular pronoun suffix: but thereafter Tav and Aleph are left stranded, and the wider problem of a large omission in OG through parablepsis going into v 43 looms. However, if the next word in

---

37 Weiss, ‘On Ligatures’, 188, note 4, gives an example of Yod and Vav giving rise to Mem in Job 20:3, where לְלַמַּזְרַת should be read as לְלַמְרַת according to Tur Sinai.
39 See Montgomery, A Critical, 468 for notes on this parablepsis and the Hexaplaric insertion; also
MT 11:41 is retroverted to Aramaic, this may help to explain the loss of a whole word:

| MT | בָּאָרָךְ הָעַבְרִי הַרְבָּהָה |
| MT > Aram | בַּבָּאָרָךְ הַלְּעֹבְרָהָא |

Here it can be seen that homoioteleuton may have caused the loss of מִרְוָה, and the Yod of the pronoun suffix in OG equivalent אַרְצָי may have been a reduplication of אָי. The larger omission in the OG of vv 41-43 could have occurred in either language at a later stage of transmission.

In 11:45 similar issues are repeated, and no doubt all the translators of the Versions were influenced by vv 16, 41. OG has θελησις in the genitive, but this time there is little potential in Hebrew for a textual error to produce a noun for ‘will, desire’, such as בְּחֵן. This leads to the suspicion that the Greek translator simply took the same sense as v16, or in both verses was simply reading an Aramaic word in the text, אַבָּר, for Hebrew אָבֶר. Other Aramaic words for ‘desire, will’ are אַרְזִים, אַרְזְיָה, and QA אַרְזִינ, ‘desire’ in Tg.Jb 15:6, 40 but none of these could be confused with other Aramaic nouns equivalent to Hebrew אָבֶר in meaning. They might be confused with אֶזְרֵי. Mt Zion itself, but if this had been in an Aramaic text, it would more likely have been transferred into a Hebrew translation too rather than an abstract term.

Yet another issue is the θ Lucianic reading σαβειρ found in 11:16, 41, 45. Montgomery explains this as a Targum of אָבֶר. 41 Of course it would not be surprising to find some explanation of the Hebrew word, written in Aramaic in an Eastern text. He retroverted the Greek transcription to סַבְּרִים, the passive participle סָבְרִים, which here would mean ‘honoured’, a good equivalent for Hebrew אָבֶר. Is it possible that סָבְרִים was the original term in Aramaic, and that this has been

---

41 Montgomery, A Critical, 440-1, note to v 16.
transmitted in a Hebrew manuscript underlying the Lucianic text? This is not impossible, but it seems unlikely. Certainly the occurrence of an Aramaic word in a Hebrew manuscript cannot be taken as evidence of an Aramaic Vorlage. If this word was the original behind the Hebrew דֶּבֶר, then exegetical considerations, such as Jerusalem as the ‘gazelle’, and the link between 8:9 and Ezek 7:20-22, become secondary matters introduced by the Hebrew translator and not in the original.  

In the four occurrences of דֶּבֶר in Hebrew Daniel, there is no certain evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage, and study of them in this context has raised more questions than it has answered. If the cumulative evidence in Hebrew Daniel and the associated textual analysis points to an Aramaic original, then the issue of what Aramaic word was translated as דֶּבֶר would have to be answered; indeed, was there only one word underlying all four occurrences of this word in Hebrew? So far the terms כּוֹרָא, טֵבֶר, דֶּבֶר and טבֵּר have been considered, but none of them explains the textual differences in all four contexts.

The Jews probably had a number of different ways of referring to the land of Judah and the Temple site in particular, in Aramaic and Hebrew. If there was an Aramaic original behind these terms in Daniel, we cannot be certain it would be the same as the targumic אֲבֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל or that it would be translated into Hebrew by a formal semantic equivalent. It would more likely be replaced by a dynamic equivalent, a Hebrew expression that indicated the same central focus of the Jewish faith. The OG תַחַנְנֵין יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּאֲפִלְתָּה תַּאֲפִלְתָּנָה for example is, apart from the definite articles, the same as אֲבֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּאֲפִלָה תַּאֲפִלְתָּה of Jer 3:19; Zech 7:14, which could be translated ‘precious land’. שָׁמַר תַּאֲפִילָה comes near to דְּמַר תַּאֲפִילָה, ‘the holy ground / land’, or ‘the ground / land of the sanctuary’ of Zech 2:12. Together with the word-play of מַעֲשֵׂה מְבַעֲשֵׂה adduced above, the subject of words used to describe the land and the Temple in Hebrew and Aramaic needs more investigation.

42 Having lost a pun in translating root כּוֹרָא by כּוֹרָא, there is no reason why a translator could not have introduced one. It may have been well known and not original to the writer of Daniel.
The unique use of the demonstrative ἐκεῖνος has already been noted.43

OG has a conflate text which most commentators recognise as deriving from two alternative readings in Hebrew.44 Montgomery and Charles retroverted OG thus:

OG ὁ ἄνθρωπος ... Ἐπὶ τὸ προσταγμα ἐκεῖνο ἡ ὁρασίς
Montgomery

בֵּרֵךְ אל הנבנלה להאיתך דומראת
המגילה
המגילה

Charles

הנבר אל הדבך להאית דומראת 45

Cf MT

בברך אל הנבנלה להאית דומראת

43 Cf page 26.
44 Montgomery, A Critical, 347; Charles, Daniel, 213-14; Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 88; Collins, Daniel, 327 note 53.
Montgomery rather neatly accounted for the second part of the clause with a different division of consonants, but the demonstrative דוא is the wrong gender when referring to Daniel, and it was not adopted by Charles. Secondly, he posited a nonsense form הֵדָם that developed into הֵמָלֶת. Charles preferred הרברַר, and he notably added the definite article to the first noun in Hebrew to account for the article in δ ἀνθρωπος. It is textually possible for a He to have arisen before רַבֵּר, from a ligature of Resh, in the preceding verb, with Gimel: the form of Gimel is similar to the left-hand stroke and horizontal of He in many scripts.46

However, the first part of the clause is easier to explain in Aramaic because הָפַכָּל without a vowel letter, could easily be read as ... לָבָּרָכָא, where the emphatic state of the noun, without any further corruption, accounts for the definite article in OG.

It is not easy to explain the rest of the clause in Aramaic, though it is interesting that Montgomery thought the form הָפַכָּל lay behind δ προσταγμα, when the former is the Aramaic equivalent. There is no Aramaic, translatable into דבֵּר or בַּלְתָּה מַלְתָּה מַלְתָּה מַלְתָּה מַלְתָּה מַלְתָּה מַלְתָּה. Charles thought the Hebrew דַּרְבּוֹר and מַכְּרָף מַכְּרָף מַכְּרָף מַכְּרָף מַכְּרָף מַכְּרָף מַכְּרָף M כַּרְבּוֹר: Haphel form, cf Aphel usage in Targums), and מַכְּרָף מַכְּרָף M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר.47 He assumed that a Hebraism, מַכְּרָף M כַּרְבּוֹר, ‘the word, matter’, was used in Aramaic. This is not impossible,48 though it cannot be used as evidence for an underlying Aramaic text. Perhaps some causative imperative of M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר M כַּרְבּוֹר was misread as from the root דַּרְבּוֹר and understood as an Hebraism: Dalet and Samek could be confused, in both early, or archaising, and Hasmonaean scripts.49

46 Cf page 289, note 9.
47 Charles, cf note 44.
48 1QapGen 6, e.g. seems to employ the Hebrew meaning of root דַּרְבּוֹר; but cf Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 54. It is not in the list of Hebrew verbs published by Fassberg, ‘Hebraisms’, 61-4.
49 For early examples see Cowley No 22, 400 BCE, in Naveh, *The Development*, Fig 9; also some Elephantine scripts in Fig. 8: for later scripts see e.g. Cross, ‘The Development’, 137, figure 1, line 7; to some extent the lower curve / hook of Samek must be lost for this confusion, unless the vertical stroke of Dalet is inadvertently given a curve to the left.
A different explanation arises from consideration of other nouns in MT which are rendered by LXX with προσταγμα. Though it is not a common equivalence, is thus translated in Lev 19:37; 26:46; Ps 7:7; Isa 26:9, and, in all these references in Targum Jonathan, the Aramaic word used is דינה. Since the root בָּצָה occurred in Aramaic as well as Hebrew, it is possible that there was some confusion between an Aramaic verbal form of בָּצָה, for example a Pael imperative בָּצָה, and the noun דינה / דינה, compounded by the similarity of this noun to the demonstrative pronoun דינה / דינה. Forms with final Aleph cause particular confusion:

MT, θ > Aram  הָבָרָא הַבַּכָּר לַדְּנָא הָלוֹא אֲדֹנָא
OG² > Aram  הָבָרָא הַדְּנָא דְָנָא הָלוֹא

In this solution, Bet would have lost its lower leftwards curve to the horizontal in order to be mistaken for Dalet. Two upper strokes of Lamed would have been lost as well. In fact, it is possible that there was an original with the name Daniel rather that the demonstrative pronoun, thus: הָבָרָא הַבַּכָּר לַדְּנָא הָלוֹא. The loss of only one Lamed at the end of דְָנָא would have produced the equivalent of MT, or the second objectival ל may not have been employed, so the Aramaic could have read, הָבָרָא הַבַּכָּר לַדְָנָא הָלוֹא, ‘Gabriel, cause Daniel to understand the vision’. Either before or after matres lectionis were added to the personal names, Bet was corrupted to Dalet, and Aleph was added by dittography, under the influence of הָלַדְּנָא. in הָבָרָא ( and helped by the following form דְָנָא הָלוֹא ), to produce the word לָדְָנָא.

50 HRp, 1219, lists eight equivalents which are: מָמַר תַּחַת, מַרְאוֹת, מַלְכוּת, חֲזֵקָה, חָכְמָה, חָרְבָּה, דּוֹר, בַּכָּר, מַשָּׁפֶט.
51 The demonstrative is used in Zech 2:8 of the visionary, as Collins, Daniel, 337, points out, but there it is an adjective, דּוֹנָא הָלָא.
53 The form נָלֵג occurs in Ezek 14:14, 20; 28:3.
Later a different division of consonants and the loss of a Lamed evolved the text underlying OG\(^2\), ὁ ἀνθρωπος...Επὶ τὸ προσταγμα ἐκεῖνο ἢ ὄφρας

Leaving aside the issue of whether the name of Daniel was originally in this text, the two points which favour an Aramaic solution above one in Hebrew are that:

1. the corruption from לְהַבָּרַא to ...לְהַבָּרַא is an easier way of explaining the difference between MT and OG\(^2\) than Hebrew ...לְהַבָּרַא:

2. there is an equivalence to προσταγμα in Aramaic עִדֵּד which could have arisen as a corruption of the verb בָּרָא.

8:27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>OG &amp; 967</th>
<th>Syh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἥνει τοὺς θηματί τοιαῦτα</td>
<td>ἐγὼ Δανιῆλ ἀσθενήσας</td>
<td>αἐμεθεὸν ἐν Δανιῆλ ἐγράμμα τοῦ Θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἔγνω Δανιῆλ ἐκοιμηθέν καὶ ἐμαλακίσθην</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>θ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>et ego Danihel langui et aegrotavi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is difficult to translate: Theodotion renders it the equivalent of ‘I slept / rested’; Jerome, ‘I fell ill’, and the Peshitta, ‘I trembled’. That OG has no equivalent may mean it is ditography of עִדֵּד. This is possible, since He could easily be an error for Het: Lamed for Ayin is attested\(^{54}\) and perhaps Lamed could therefore be taken as Yod. Charles understood the verb this way,\(^{55}\) yet OG may just as easily have omitted the word if the translator could not construe it sensibly.

\(^{54}\) Cf page 160 for 4QDan\(^5\) in 11:17.

\(^{55}\) Charles, A Critical, 221.
Bevan translated ‘I came to an end’, i.e. ‘I was exhausted’ but admitted that the verb bore this sense nowhere else.\textsuperscript{56} He thought the Peshitta’s reading was a guess.\textsuperscript{57} Montgomery translated ‘I was befallen’, with a query, and noted the weaknesses in other attempts to explain the verb here and in 2:1.\textsuperscript{58} Collins seems to follow Kimhi in making use of the root רְדֵד with some sense of ‘ruin’ and translates ‘I was undone’.\textsuperscript{59}

Hartman followed Ginsberg in translating ‘I was dazed’, but he allowed that there could have been a corruption in Hebrew or in Aramaic to produce this rendering.\textsuperscript{60} Ginsberg based his solution on Syriac מוד, to ‘be dazed’, which occurs in BA as *hapax legomenon* in 3:24, מודְלָנָא מִכְּנֶנֶנָא דְּנֵא קָלֶא אֶלֶף, ‘Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was amazed / startled...’ He theorised that the original verb was נָדָדַּנֶא, an Ethpaal,\textsuperscript{61} which was misread as a reflexive stem of כָּוָד, רוֹדוֹדַּנֶא ( = רוֹדוֹדַּנֶא ), and was turned into a Hebrew Niphal of רְדֵד. He related this idea to the verb in 2:1 and proposed that there נָדָדַּנֶא arose from מְדַדֶּנֶא misread as נָדָדַּנֶא.\textsuperscript{62}

There are three weaknesses in Ginsberg’s solution: firstly, the Ethpaal of רְדֵד is not attested in Jewish Aramaic, so he had to appeal to Syriac for support: secondly, the reflexive stem of כָּוָד is not attested in Aramaic: thirdly, the sense ‘was amazed, startled’ is difficult to apply to the king’s sleep ( rather than to the king himself) in 2:1, though Ginsberg suggests tentatively that it might mean ‘was troubled’.

\textsuperscript{56} Bevan, *A Short Commentary*, 140.
\textsuperscript{57} Taylor, *The Peshitta*, 214, 224-5, came to the same conclusion as Bevan.
\textsuperscript{58} Montgomery, *A Critical*, 355-6. He summarised the problem succinctly in his comment on Driver’s equating the word in 2:1 and 8:27 with English ‘done for’: ‘...it is doubtful if the same vb. could mean, the sleep was done, and the seer was done for’!
\textsuperscript{59} Collins, *Daniel*, 328; Montgomery, ibid.
\textsuperscript{60} Hartman & Di Lella, *Daniel*, 229.
\textsuperscript{61} This is Ginsberg’s term, rather than Ithpaal, presumably influenced by the Syriac.
\textsuperscript{62} Ginsberg, *Studies*, 59.
None of the attempts at explanation over the years really solves the problem of making sense of the verb as it is used in 2:1 and here in 8:27 and a fresh approach is needed.

A search for a different root suggests that יתרזגנ could be first singular perfect of the Lamed-He verb ידה, where the first Yod is consonantal and the second is a vowel letter. Since double Yod usually indicates the root ידה, there may have been a simple dittography of Yod or mater lectionis may have been added to the consonants because it was understood to be a Niphal of ידה. The verb therefore may originally have been יתרזגנ.

The Hebrew root ידה, which is the one used in Micah 2:4, is rare, and means ‘wail, lament’. In Daniel it is better understood as a calque of the Aramaic root ידה which means ‘move, be in commotion’, i.e. to ‘be disturbed / agitated’. This sense admirably describes the state of Daniel here and of the king’s sleep in 2:1. Understood in this light, the Peshitta’s בק was not a guess. The Eastern Aramaic translator understood the Aramaism and either interpreted it in the physical sense as ‘trembled’, which symptom would generally indicate emotional turmoil, or he knew that the root carried this literal meaning. The verbs should be pointed, in 2:1, ידה and here, ידה.66

This understanding of יתרזגנ offers a more sensible meaning than the MT pointing, but no definite indication of an underlying Aramaic Vorlage.

---

63 Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic, 159, 4, (1), I and II ( where DSD = 1QS ), notes this phenomenon in Qumran orthography only with root ידה: in 1QS iii 15 ידה is Niphal of ידה.
64 See Chapter One, page 17.
65 This understanding of the Syriac translator may have influenced his reading of the next Hebrew verb ידה, which was translated as סלחתו, ‘and I was shaken’, where Taylor, The Peshitta, 225, suggests the Hebrew root may have been taken as ידה instead of ידה.
66 Four mss of Kennicott have ידה in MT of Dan 8:27, but even more read ידה for the next verb; the reverse is the case in 2:1 where six mss read ידה. It is doubtful that any significance can be drawn from these spelling variations in mediaeval manuscripts.
Either מַעֲנֶה, to ‘be weary’, or מַעֲנֶה, to ‘fly’ may be the basis of this phrase. מַעֲנֶה may be Hophal participle of מַעֲנֶה, meaning ‘wearied’: מַעֲנֶה may comprise ב attached to מַעֲנֶה ‘weariness’. The phrase could describe Daniel, and this is how Charles understood it, translating, ‘being sore weary’. The alternative is to take the root as מַעֲנֶה: the Hophal participle is מַעֲנֶה and, referring to Gabriel, the phrase would translate as ‘flying with flight’ or ‘flying with weariness’. Zimmerman understood the root as מַעֲנֶה but was puzzled by the passive participle in מַעֲנֶה, how and why it applied to Gabriel, and how the meaning ‘swiftly’ derived from the root to ‘fly’. His solution based on Aramaic מַעֲנֶה כְּפַר, ‘enveloped in a covering’, has obvious weaknesses, the lack of textual support for this interpretation and the absence of any other evidence that the angel was dressed in this manner.

Hartman preferred a translation, ‘flying like a bird’. He insisted that MT could only mean ‘wearied with weariness’ and since this was ‘nonsense’ the Versions were correct to associate the words with flying. He thought the Hebrew perhaps reflected use of מַעֲנֶה in Isa 6:2, and the participial construction was based on the underlying

67 Cf page 45.
68 Charles, A Critical, 235; KB3, Vol 2, 421 identifies this as the traditional reading under מַעֲנֶה.
69 Cf page 45 again. Thus Montanus, according to Montgomery, A Critical, 372, rendered the phrase ‘he was weary from his long flight’.
70 Zimmermann, Biblical Books, 29-30; cf page 74.
Aramaic, so the original Hebrew was probably \( \text{גַּלְגָּלֵי} \). He arrived at the sense ‘like a bird’ with reference to \( \text{סִנֹּת} \) which, although a collective noun in classical Hebrew, was used as a singular later: thus he implied that should be read \( \text{בְּעֵית} \).\(^{71}\) Hartman’s idea, though, based on viable textual errors in Hebrew, has similar weaknesses to Zimmermann’s, i.e., lack of textual support for the meaning ‘like a bird’, and lack of any evidence in Daniel that the angel’s mode of ‘travel’ was comparable to that of a bird.

Bevan, Montgomery and Collins seemed unable to come to a decisive interpretation for these two words, though the latter two allowed there may have been a textual error, a dittography or double reading,\(^{72}\) which could be supported by the single word in Theodotion’s reading. Montgomery noted that several scholars had relied upon Arabic cognates, in particular, J D Michaelis, who found a parallel between \( \text{עֲנָי} \) and Arabic \( \text{waghafa} \), ‘hasten’ to give the sense ‘wearied by haste’.\(^{73}\)

All the Versions witness to two words except Theodotion, but Montgomery noted that even this witness has a variant in Origen which adds \( \text{ἐν πετωσμῷ} \),\(^{74}\) meaning literally, ‘with outspreading’. If this clumsy attempt to render the Hebrew was original to Theodotion, it is perhaps not surprising that it was omitted in most manuscripts! If it was an addition after the simple rendering \( \text{πετωμενός} \), this may indicate the Hebrew is a conflation of two readings or it may witness to a dittography.\(^{75}\)

---

\(^{71}\) Hartman \& Di Lella, Daniel, 243, citing, for an example of \( \text{סִנֹּת} \) as a singular noun, Berakoth 63a

\(^{72}\) Bevan, A Short Commentary, 152; Montgomery, A Critical, 372; he translated them ‘borne in swift flight’, 370: Collins, Daniel, 345, note 39; 351-352; he combines his translation with that of \( \text{סִנֹּת} \) to produce the sense ‘approached me in flight’, 345.

\(^{73}\) Ibid.

\(^{74}\) Montgomery, A Critical, 372, cf p xxxi, attributed this reading to Palestinian Origenian texts which comprise V, 62, 147; Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 188, attributed it only to ms 62.

\(^{75}\) Ziegler, ibid., noted that Tertullian supported Theodotion, reading, volans.
Thus מַעְעַה could have been vocalised מַעְעַה and this could have been copied as מַעְעַה, with the readings coming together by conflation. An alternative might be מַעְעַה, written as מַעְעַה with a Yod developed as a dittography of Ayin. This does not account for the anomalous Hophal participle, for with preformative Mem it has to be Hophal, since it would not make sense pointed as the causative Hiphil, when the Polel form is usual. It could be speculated with Hartman that one Pe had been lost from original מַעְעַה. If the form with Bet is taken as original, then perhaps מַעְעַה, meaning ‘in flight (drew near)’, was miscopied as מַעְעַה in one manuscript and was corrupted to מַעְעַה in another, and MT is a conflation of both. The main stumbling block to any of these solutions is that all other primary Versions witness to two words, most notably OG.

Of the Versions, the Peshitta appears to be nearest to MT, in that the two Syriac words are from the same root, having read both the Hebrew ones from מַעְעַה. The first verb מַעְעַה appears to be a Peal participle, taking מַעְעַה to mean ‘flying’, and the second, as Montgomery suggests, appears to be the infinitive, but it is not clear exactly what this construction would indicate to a Syriac reader in the context of flight. Theodotion, and Jerome have apparently understood the Hebrew to refer to flying.

OG has the general term φερομένος which the Syro-Hexapla has interpreted by the common root φερ. However, the semantic range of φερέω must be clearly understood: the passive voice can be used in all senses of the active, but also with the metaphorical ideas of ‘fly, swing free, move, go, rush’: LS gives the examples, ἴκε φερεθεί, ‘he sent him flying’, and φερομένοι ἔσπειρον, ‘they fell...with a

---

76 The Polel participle מַעְעַה is found in Isa 14:29; 30:6: see BDB, 773; KB3, Vol 2, 800-1.
77 Montgomery, cf note 74.
78 The difficulty of this phrase is probably the reason for the explanatory addition in the Peshitta, מַעְעַה כָּתָה אָלֶֽם, ‘and he flew and came from heaven’; cf Taylor, The Peshitta, 233, 242.
rush, at full speed'. So OG ταχύει φαρομενος could mean simply ‘moving quickly’, or ‘rushing with speed’, or metaphorically, ‘flying rapidly’. המָטָה does not seem to have been interpreted literally by OG, as it was by the later Versions, but neither was it understood to mean ‘weary’. So OG appears to have taken בִּימְעַה figurally, though the passive form of the Greek does not necessarily reflect the Hophal participle in the Hebrew. It is less clear how the sense of ταχύει is gleaned from בִּימְעַה.

It is a general linguistic phenomenon that verbs meaning to ‘fly’ can be used figurally, of rapid movement other than winged flight, in or over other mediums besides air. This is certainly true of volo, employed by Jerome, and of רָכַב as used in the Peshitta. It may be true of עַשְׁחֵה in BH: it is used of rapid progress of armies in e.g. Hab 1:8 of פֶּסַח likened to the eagle; of the Philistines in Isa 11:14 where תְּעַפְּרֹת becomes פְּלַשׁוּתִים seems to be a movement like a bird of prey; it occurs in Isa 60:8 comparing ships to clouds and doves, though this must be due in part to the appearance of the sails. Then רקח describes a serpent in Isa 14:20; 30:6, usually translated as a ‘flying serpent’, but an epithet which could describe its rapid movement over land. Certainly, the Targums translate some occurrences of רקח in MT with words denoting speed: so in 2 Sam 22:11 and Ps 18:11 יִכְּלֵל is used; in Isa 31:5 the root סָחַט, to ‘fly swiftly’; and in 60:8 דְּאַתָּן בְּנֶל, ‘that come suddenly / rapidly’. So it is quite possible that the way OG and Vulgate understood these words derives from MT, but this still does not explain why the unique forms of MT were used.

79 LS, Vol 2, 1924.
80 KB3, Vol 2; BDB, 753.
It is surprising that none of the above scholars, not even Zimmermann or Hartman, investigated Aramaic roots meaning ‘fly’. The standard equivalent of עֹלַֽה in the Targums is the same root used by the Peshitta, חָלֵֽה, which has the following semantic range in its different stems:

חָלֵֽה

| Peal | Bloom; move swiftly, fly, swim, run; palpitate; cause to flee, keep off |
| Pael | Cause to fly; carry off |
| Aphel | Produce blossom, bloom; fly; cause to fly, carry off, chase off. |

Less common is חָלֵֽע, which has a similar range to its Hebrew cognate:

חָלֵֽע

| Peal | Glisten; fly swiftly |
| Pael | Same; cause to fly |

There is also חָלֵֽר:

חָלֵֽר

| Peal | (break through); fly |
| Aphel | Cause to bloom |

If an Aramaic expression is behind the use of חָלֵֽה, the common root חָלֵֽה is the most likely, for it would explicate the form of the Hebrew participle as a calque of the Aphel: i.e. since this stem can mean ‘fly’ (intransitive) like the Peal, the writer may have attributed the same meaning to the Hebrew causative: this suggests the Hebrew participle is actually Hiphil and not Hophal.

However the root חָלֵֽע can mean ‘fly swiftly’ in the Pael stem, and in the same way it could have given rise to a participle in Hebrew with a causal stem form. In this

83 Ja, Vol 2, 1223. The cognate root in BH is used in the sense ‘sprout, blossom’, but the participles in Ezek 13:20 may be Aramaisms meaning ‘flyers’; see BDB, 827, KB3, Vol 3, 966 which gives these meanings under two roots; Ja lists both Hebrew and Aramaic under one root each, with a similar semantic range.

84 Ja, Vol 1, 524-5.

85 Ja, Vol 2, 1236.
case the Aramaic verb would have provided the meaning of the whole phrase as understood in OG, ‘flying swiftly’.

Neither of these explanations accounts for the singular expression in BH יִתְכָּה. This is best explained by the third root, from which the noun כַּרְדָּא, meaning ‘speed’ is derived and the adverbial expression בְּלַיְלָה which means ‘quickly’. The simplest solution is to understand the phrase in Hebrew as a calque of the Aramaic expression מֵפְרָדַר בֶּהֶד, ‘flying quickly’, and to assume that the OG translator understood the calque. This does not account for the Yod in the expression יִתְכָּה. יִתְכָּה is probably a noun derived from Hebrew יָכָה, related to יָכָה and / or the idea of speed.

10:13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>דָּבָר וְהָנָתְכָּךְ יָכָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>יָכָה הַיָּמִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>et ego remansi ibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>καὶ αὐτὸν κατελίπον ἐκεῖ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG &amp; 967</td>
<td>καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ κατελίπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syh</td>
<td>אָכָה הַיָּמִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MT reads ‘I was left / left over there ( before the kings of Persia )’. The meaning of הָנָתְכָּךְ in this context has caused problems for commentators and most follow the Greek texts, but the Peshitta and Vulgate support MT, each in its own way.

---

86 Ja, Vol 2, 1227.
87 In this case, Jerome was probably following OG.
88 KB3, Vol 2, 421, יָכָה‖, where it is regarded as a noun with Aramaised pointing יָכָה; see H Bauer & P Leander, Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des alten Testamentes, Band 1 (1922, Halle, Max Niemeyer), 470, f.a.
89 Montgomery, A Critical, 410 ( though he indicates the sense of MT in parenthesis ); Charles, A Critical, 262; Collins, Daniel, 362, note 32.
90 See Montgomery, ibid, for an assessment of these Versions.
The Greek, meaning ‘I left him (Michael) there’, makes more sense in the context of vv 12-14, than that Gabriel, the speaker, was left (to confront the prince of Persia), for he was the angel who had arrived to speak to Daniel.\(^91\)

Scholars have attributed a variety of senses to Hebrew נָשָׁה, such as ‘be pre-eminent’ (Gesenius et al.), ‘be delayed’ (Hitzig), ‘be superfluous’ (Ewald).\(^92\)

Ginsberg adopted a different approach, because he retroverted the clause in MT to Aramaic as רַבָּה אָנוּבּ, but concluded that קָאִין was a mistake for בֻּן, and he translated, ‘the latter has remained (there)’. He noted that the passive consonantal forms of these Aramaic verbs could be either first person singular imperfect or third person singular perfect.\(^93\) His solution was not straightforward because it assumed that Aleph could be read for Dalet, which is not a common textual error, and it made the verb, to which the MT reading must be traced, a first person imperfect which is the wrong tense in context.

The semantic ranges of the Hebrew root and possible Aramaic equivalents are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew נָשָׁה</th>
<th>Niphal</th>
<th>be over, remain over, be left, left over, remain, be enriched?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiphil</td>
<td>leave over, leave, leave behind, save over (preserve alive), release; excel, be pre-eminent, have / show excess, have remaining, have more than enough, make abundant, enrich, give abundantly(^94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piel</td>
<td>add, do too much; passive participle, added, superfluous(^95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^91\) Taylor, *The Peshitta*, 252, 257-8, notes that the Peshitta ignores the independent pronoun and prefers the verb by itself. It is unlikely that the pronoun was missing in its *Vorlage*.

\(^92\) Ibid.


\(^94\) BDB 451; KB3, Vol 21, 451-2 traces two different roots; Cl, Vol 4, 343-4.

\(^95\) Ja, Vol 1, 604.
There are a number of possible solutions to the problem with the verb in MT

1. The Hebrew root in the Niphal may carry the sense to ‘be superfluous to requirement’, possibly a rare meaning, or one that is by chance unattested elsewhere.

2. Since the idea of superfluity is present in the Aramaic Ithpaal and in the later Hebrew Piel, the usage here may be a calque of Aramaic in MT, and Aramaic may also have influenced the passive meaning of the Piel in a later stage of Hebrew.

Yet these do not address the problem of the OG reading. To solve this in Hebrew there seems to be no way of improving upon the popular emendation of Graetz, who suggested the text אַתָּה הַדִּבְרֵיתָא, ‘and him I left’.97

MT אַתָּה הַדִּבְרֵיתָא
Graetz אַתָּה הַדִּבְרֵיתָא

This requires the mechanical confusion between Tav Vav He, and Nun Yod Nun of the MT, which means the difference of two vertical strokes, since there are three in the latter and five in the emendation. This is not an unreasonable suggestion given the number of vertical strokes in both readings, and it has already been noted that the left stroke of Tav is very similar to a Nun.

Ginsberg’s solution is another possibility, but it is unnecessary to change the person of the initial pronoun as he did, to find an Aramaic explanation for the difference between OG and MT. The Ithpaal and Aphel perfect look very similar in this root

96 Ibid. Sokoloff, 248.
97 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 168; Charles, A Critical, 262; Hartman & Di Lella, cf note 93.
and they have a variant form in common. First person singular forms could have been:

Aramaic: יָרָּה | Aphel Perfect: לָאָירָמָה, I left (transitive)
| Ithpaal Perfect: לָאָירָמָה, "I was superfluous"

BA forms with similar meanings would yield the following:

Haphel Perfect: לָאָירָמָה, נָשָׁמָה
Hitpaal Perfect: לָאָירָמָה, נָשָׁמָה

The ease with which a causative and passive form could be confused if Aphel and Ithpaal forms were in use is evident above. The remaining parts of the textual problem would be the same with BA forms or later, but it is worth using BA stems to show how confusing this text could have been.

MT > BA: אָמַה הָדִיתְתָה תַּמָּה
OG > BA: אָמַה הָדִיתְתָה תַּמָּה

The occurrence of He at the end of the pronoun and Tav at the beginning of the adverb, plus the addition of the pronominal suffix, He, turn either text into the graphic equivalent of a tongue-twister. It does not take much imagination to see how a scribe or translator could have been confused, and the meaning of either variant would suit the context. So whether in Biblical Aramaic or a later style, these solutions to the difference between OG and MT offer superior alternatives to any in Hebrew.

---

98 Ja, cf note 95.
11:6b Whole Text

**MT** ἐκαίνες τὸν καρπὸν ἵνα ἐκτείνῃ τὸ δέσμευμα ἵνα τὸ ἄλλο ἅπαθεν γίνῃ.(καί δὲ) ἡ πώσις τῆς ἐκφάγης οὐκ ἔχει σύμβολα.

**θ** καὶ οὐ κρατησεὶ ἱσχυν ἅριστονος, καὶ οὐ στησεῖται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ παραδόθησεται αὐτῇ καὶ οἱ φεροντες αὐτὴν καὶ ἡ νεανίς καὶ ὁ κατασχούς αὐτὴν ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς.

**S** σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐνεχθεῖ, καὶ ἡ πώσις τῆς ἐκφάγης συναναγώγηται 599 ἀπὸ τοῦ κεφαλαρίου ἀνακρίνουσας τοῦ ἕκατον εἰς τὸν πρότερον καιρὸν.

**V** et non obtinebit fortitudinem brachii nec stabit semen eius et tradetur ipsa et qui adduxerunt eam adulescentes eius et qui confortabant eam in temporibus

**σ** καὶ οὐ στησεῖται πρὸς τὴν ἱσχὺν τοῦ βραχίουνος καὶ οὐχ ὑποστησεῖται οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ

[ s ὑπομενεὶ ]

**OG** καὶ οὖ ἡ κατασχυσή, ὅτι ὁ βραχίουν αὐτοῦ οὐ στησεὶ ἱσχὺν καὶ ὁ βραχίουν αὐτοῦ ναρκησει καὶ τῶν συμπόρευουσιιν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μενεὶ εἰς ὁρας.

**967** καὶ οὐ μὴ κατεισχύσαις ὅτι ὁ βραχίουν αὐτοῦ συστησεὶ ἱσχὺν(ν) καὶ ὁ βραχίουν αὐτοῦ οὐ συστησεὶ ἱσχὺν καὶ ὁ βραχίουν αὐτοῦ ναρκησει καὶ τῶν συμπόρευουσιιν μετ ἀυτοῦ καὶ μενεὶ εἰς ὁρας100

**Syh** Καὶ ὁ μὴ κατεισχύσαις οὐδὲ οὐ συστησεῖ ἱσχὺν ἀλλὰ ὃ ἐνεχθεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ χείλειαν εἰς τὸν πρότερον καιρὸν.

---

99 Ms 7th reads ἀκαίρη; cf VTS Part III, 4, 39. See Taylor, The Peshitta, 276, for comments on the shorter text of the Peshitta.

100 967 has inner Greek errors: firstly, it read συστησεῖ for οὐ στησεῖ; secondly, it has an apparent dittography, which is in fact the correction of the first error, from its second ὅ βραχίουν to the following ἱσχὺν. See Geissen, Papyrus 967, 246-7.
Problems in 11:6 have already been described, as has a suggested loss of the equivalent of בַּי in Aramaic, leading to an OG reading. V 7a in MT was found to be conflate due to an ambiguous Aramaic text. The difficulties of v 6b, which lies between these two sections, have been explained in the light of the notorious historical events to which they seem to refer, i.e. the murder of Antiochus II, Berenice and her infant son at the instance of Laodice.

Confusion in Hebrew has arisen because of the following factors among others:

a. the substantive בַּי can mean ‘arm, army, force, power’;
b. this noun, written defectively, can be confused with בִּנְי, ‘seed, offspring’;
c. the third masculine singular suffix written י and the letter Zayin, can each be confused with the conjunction, Vav.

In Aramaic confusion between terms for ‘arm’, בַּי, and ‘seed’, בִּנְי, is not as simple as in Hebrew, but the consonants Dalet and Zayin can be interchanged. Possibly more pertinent in Aramaic is the ease with which the suffixes of the emphatic, and the third masculine and feminine singular pronouns, all expressed by the consonantal suffix He, may be confused. Most of the variants in the Versions can be explained in terms of Hebrew, but the OG exhibits greater differences from MT. It seems best to divide this complex text into the following sections for analysis:

1. לא תעזור חם חורש ולא יעמור והר
2. ונתן די
3. נביאה והיולה
4. ותתוקה
5. ונתים

101 Cf Chapter One, pages 18, 36, 49.
102 Cf pages 137-42.
103 Cf pages 257-63.
Theodotion supports MT except that ἵσσιν ὑπάρχειν is indefinite (and this version usually supplies the Greek definite article where there is one in MT), which is probably due to loss of He before Het in Hebrew. Theodotion, Symmachus and the Vulgate understand ἡ χείρ ἡ δύναμις in a genitive relationship, and they all read ἰτερα as ‘his seed’ rather than ‘his force/army’. The θ and V texts also witness to absence of a conjunction after Ἰννῦλον, a loss of Vav before Zayin.

The Peshitta has some inner Syriac errors from confusion between roots סָמָא and סָמָא. If the variant סָמָא was correct,106 the negative particle שׁ may have been lost after it, and וָ may in some way derive from סָמָא, which could have been in the text as equivalent of עַלְבָד. If סָמָא are corruptions of forms of סָמָא, expressions translated from MT יד ו realtà / ραιτι, these may give some clues to a possible Aramaic Vorlage, but no more that this.107

OG καὶ οὴ μὴ κατάσχομεν seems to reflect ἴτερα ἔχειν,108 but the common gender of the Greek verb does not show whether a masculine or feminine was in the Vorlage. The narrative in OG requires a masculine to agree with βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου, but a feminine verb could have been taken as impersonal, meaning ‘but it will not prevail’. In Hebrew, ὅτι ό Βραχίον would be כ יררה, where represented reduplication of דב with Het lost before He, and Vav read as Yod. However, the Greek genitive masculine singular pronoun αὐτοῦ, with no conjunction following, indicates the OG Vorlage read כ יררה. So both Het and He were lost, one through haplography and the other possibly because it resembled a

105 Cf page 278 for discussion of these Aramaic words; page 137 for interchange of Dalet and Zayin.
106 Cf note 99.
107 Taylor, The Peshitta, 283, thinks the Syriac translator read MT יד ו ישוע as עיר or עיר ה and then produced a paraphrase to clarify the meaning. He may well be correct, but the point is not important enough for our purpose to pursue here.
ligature of Yod and Zayin. Lastly OG has ṣχν, which, according to this scheme, may be an alternative reading to ṣחנ, the equivalent of MT חנן, or it may be an alternative understanding of חנן, without conjunction or suffix. This suggests OG is conflate.

As noted by many, the expression חנן usually has the noun in the definite state: Montgomery considered חנן ‘suspicious’, parenthesising חנן. There is no reason in Hebrew for such a conflate text, and Montgomery had to suggest some contamination from 10:17, חנן בי חנן. It might be better to take the sense of חנן as ‘power of the seed / offspring’, i.e. ‘power of the succession’, which was really the type of power Berenice held temporarily. If this was adopted, along with the lack of conjunction between חנן suggested by חנן and חנן suggested by חנן and חנן, the meaning would be, ‘but she will not retain the power of succession, nor will her (male) offspring endure’.

Retroversion of MT and Versions to Aramaic would be:

MT > Aram ַלַּא נִשְׁאֵר חָיוֶלֶת וּלָא קְוֵמַת וּרְדוּתָהוּלַּא לִי רְדוּתָה

0, V > Aram ַלַּא נִשְׁאֵר חָיוֶלֶת וּלָא קְוֵמַת וּרְדוּתָהוּלַּא נִשְׁאֵר חָיוֶל אִזָּרִי רְדוּתָה לָא קְוֵמַת [ חָיוֶל ] וּרְדוּתָה

OG > Aram ַלַּא נִשְׁאֵר חָיוֶל אִזָּרִי רְדוּתָה לָא קְוֵמַת [ חָיוֶל ] וּרְדוּתָה

Three things are noteworthy in this retroversion.

a. The genitive construction חנן supplies a superior explanation for OG חנן than the Hebrew above, because this would be easily read חנן אִזָּרִי רְדוּתָה, ַלַּא נִשְׁאֵר חָיוֶל אִזָּרִי רְדוּתָה לָא קְוֵמַת [ חָיוֶל ] וּרְדוּתָה.

---

108 This equivalence occurs in OG at the end of 10:8.
109 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 175; Montgomery, A Critical, 428, 430; Charles, A Critical, 279.
110 Ibid.
where יָרֶק is a common equivalent of בֵּית.\textsuperscript{111} This requires only a different division of consonants and interchange of Dalet and Resh, without the need to resort to haplography.

b. If דָּרָה , retroverted from 0 and V, is the correct reading, the loss of the conjunction before it would be just as likely as with MT עלות because in each case the loss is before Zayin.

c. In OG, the putative extra לְרָה, equivalent of וּשלָה, ought to be definite or carry a suffix if it is an alternative understanding of דָּרָה; this means וּשלָה is best taken as a translation of ועלות of MT, but without the conjunction or the suffix, the one lost before Zayin (in either Hebrew or Aramaic, as above), and the other before the Vav which follows in MT.

2) התנתק היתה

This phrase is usually translated ‘she will be handed over’, cf Theodotion, the Peshitta and the Vulgate. It is another characteristically vague expression, where a stronger one might be more fitting, and seems almost euphemistic. Bevan noted that a preposition or the phrase דָּרָה is required,\textsuperscript{112} but then it is not stated into whose power the princess falls. Others thought the term לְרָה was needed, as in Ezek 31:14.\textsuperscript{113} There appears to be no potential for any of these words to have been lost through textual error in Hebrew.

The surprising verb in OG, ναρκησαι, ‘will be rigid / numb’ with βραχιων as the subject (where the conjunction was lost after وعلى), is another great problem. This

\textsuperscript{111} Ja, Vol 1, 118: alternative forms are דָּרֶק and בֵּירתֶק; see KB3, Vol V, 1123-1124; Sokoloff
\textsuperscript{74}. יָרֶק occurs in QA, e.g. lQapGen 3; 19; 20; 22; 21,14.
\textsuperscript{112} Bevan; cf note 109.
\textsuperscript{113} Montgomery, Charles; cf note 109.
rare verb in LXX is used for יַשְׁבִּי, ‘dislocate’, and יָדוֹ, ‘vein, sinew’, in Gen 32:26, 33 respectively, and for the word קָרָן in Job 33:19. Here LXX seems to have understood a verb from an Eastern Aramaic root, ק. The Syriac form can mean to ‘be numb, rigid’, to ‘stiffen’, and also to ‘smoke’: the Ethpeal carries the sense to ‘smoulder, be reduced to smoke’, the Ethpael to ‘be stupefied, smoked out’.115 Jewish Aramaic has the root קָרָן which is only cited with the meaning to ‘smoke’.116 It is likely that OG had some form such as קָרָנ or קָרָנָה in its Hebrew manuscript instead of קָרָנָה. With loss of the conjunction after רָעַר, the OG took the latter as the subject of this verb, inferring the sense, ‘his arm will be numb’ (i.e. paralysed?). If the Greek translator took this literally, it was also understood to refer to ‘those who travelled with him’, but it was more probably read as a metaphor of the powerlessness of Ptolemy.

קָרָנ of course occurs in Aramaic, so a similar confusion could perhaps have occurred in that language. However, in neither language does this explicate use of קָרָנ without modification, unless קָר or קָרָנ was in the original, and this verb indicated death in some way.

It seems best to take the reading of the OG Hebrew Vorlage as a corruption of קָרָנ and to adopt the explanation of Hartman, who said this translated a form of Aramaic מָסָר. Its semantic range was similar to the cognate Hebrew, ‘seize, hand over, deliver, transmit, surrender to authorities, inform against’. With מָסָר it meant ‘suffer martyrdom’, and in the Ithpeal, to ‘be surrendered, surrender oneself’. Although, like מָסָר, מָסָר often took a preposition, it was used alone with the implication of delivery to a hostile authority. Hartman maintained that it could mean ‘betray’, and the

114 Charles, A Critical, 279, makes use of analogy with יַשְׁבִּי in Gen 32:33 to emend קָרָנ in Daniel to יָדוֹ, meaning ‘she will be rooted up’; Montgomery, A Critical, 432, refers to קָרָן in Job 33, but he does not develop this connection.
115 PS 615; PS, Tomus II, 4462-3.
116 Ja, Vol 2, 1682; Sokoloff, 587.
Ithpeal meaning, ‘be betrayed’ would provide an apt description of the fates of the protagonists.\textsuperscript{117}

OG has no equivalent of the feminine pronoun יְדוֹת. This could have been lost in Hebrew because of parablepsis involving רביה which follows, or the Greek translator may have ignored the word in the Vorlage because it made no sense to add this emphasis after reference to the princess was lost.

3) \textit{ומכיאת והילדה}

MT can be translated, ‘and those who brought her and he who fathered her’. The first verb is not problematic, referring to the entourage of the princess, some of whom were killed with her.

נהלהד does not make sense\textsuperscript{118} in terms of history, for Berenice’s father’s death occurred in Egypt, and he was not ‘delivered up’ or ‘betrayed’. It is amended to הַנָּלִית, ‘her child’, by most scholars.\textsuperscript{119} Cf Vol 4, 216, suggests נַעְלֵי, girl, and Montgomery retroverted \textit{ה} to נַעְלֵי, which is a better grammatical reading of MT, but makes the child the wrong gender. The Peshitta may have had this reading as well, but with a plural as an inner Syriac error.\textsuperscript{120} The Vulgate has read a plural, but since it is masculine, this is probably due to an additional mater lectionis resulting in נהלהד. This odd form may have been understood by Jerome as a plural passive participle, unless the word in his manuscript was without the definite article. The

\textsuperscript{117} Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 266, however, translated ‘will be delivered up’, p 257. The most specific sense would be ‘suffer martyrdom’, but there is no graphic potential for the noun שִׁמְפִּים to have fallen from the text. This meaning might be derived from קִימָה \ אֹהֶל הָכָה, where the emphatic form could have been misread as the feminine pronoun קִימה. However, it is doubtful if וכ can be used as a synonym of שִׁמְפִּים, or if the emphatic form of the noun would be appropriate.

\textsuperscript{118} Cf Chapter One, page 49.

\textsuperscript{119} Montgomery, \textit{A Critical}, 430; Charles, cf note 114; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 266, note t-t; also KB3, Vol 2, 411.

\textsuperscript{120} Taylor, \textit{The Peshitta}, 279, thinks this version had this reading in its Vorlage and takes the plural to be intended as ‘her maids’. This is one of a sequence of three plurals in the Peshitta.
problem in retroverting the Vulgate is the same as faced in construing the pointing of MT.

Ginsberg suggested the alternatives הָרִים, with otiose vowel letter ה, or הָרִים, ‘he whom she has borne’, deriving the form from a putative Aramaic רָיוּד, which should have been רַיוֹד in Hebrew. Zimmermann appealed to Eastern Syriac, positing an original Aramaic רוּד לא, ‘a child’, misread as רוּד, ‘a parent’.121

Of the three elements to the word in MT,

i) the suffix is the correct gender, but as pointed it is accusative, when a genitive would make better sense:

ii) the participle is active, meaning ‘one who bore, progenitor’, whereas a passive participle, meaning ‘child’, cf 1 Kgs 3:26, 27, would accord better with historical knowledge:

iii) the definite article is the key problem, for attached to a participle with a suffix,122 it has forced the masoretes to read an active participle with an accusative suffix, ‘the one who fathered her’. A passive participle can only sensibly carry a genitive suffix (because the passive voice is intransitive) and does not need the article because the suffix makes it definite123: in other words, a passive participle with a pronoun suffix functions as a noun. In this case the literal meaning ‘her borne one’ = ‘the one born of her’, would be represented by רוּד, or רוּד.124

121 Cf page 65 for Zimmermann, and page 100 for Ginsberg.

122 A participle can take the definite article and a pronominal suffix; cf GKC 116 f, 127 i; Bevan, 
A Short Commentary, 175, accepted Isa 9:12 רוּד as an example; Charles, A Critical, 279, considered it ‘abnormal’. The phenomenon is logical, since a participle is a verbal noun; but note the difference between an active and passive participle explained above.

123 BW gives 750 matches for Qal passive participles, 136 of these with the definite article. Of 74 Qal passive and Pual participles with pronominal suffixes, none has the definite article. BW gives no matches for Hophal participles with pronominal suffixes.

If the original Hebrew was דֵּל with suffix, יַּלְדוּ, referring to the young prince, then He of the definite article can be traced to a simple dittoography under the influence of the suffix on the preceding word, ...יִדּ... 

OG lacks any equivalent of the word, possibly because it did not make any sense in the verse as construed in that translation. Were the Greek text the equivalent of MT except for this word, it might be argued that it had been omitted by homoioteleuton, because of the series of feminine singular suffixes in the text. However, OG has no equivalent for any of these suffixes. Its retroverted text for this whole phrase amounts to: דַּבָאָא עִיָ ת and, apart from the similarities in the verb, there is not much to trace this reading to common forms with MT.

| MT        | המבריאת והיילדה
| OG > Heb  | התבאות עמי
| MT > Aram | נמימי היילדה (Haphel participle with suffix )
| OG > Aram | נמימי היילדה (Aphel participle with suffix )
|           | האריא עמה
|           | הד אהתיא עמה

A textual solution in either language would require Yod in יִלְדוּ to be read as Ayin, and the top stroke of Lamed to be lost so that its lower stroke, the hook, formed a ligature with Dalet to produce a Mem: thus the preposition בע could have been formed. However, the change in suffix is more easily explained in Aramaic because no change of consonant is needed for a misreading to occur.

The change of participle and loss of its suffix is difficult to explain in either language. There is clearly possibility for metathesis of Mem, Bet and Aleph in Hebrew, but having removed the definite article from יִלְדוּ as a dittoography, it is not easy to see how the suffix on the participle could also have been lost. It is
perhaps easier to see the Mem as lost before Bet, and the He of the suffix read as Mem thus (without the vowel letter):

בָּאֵימ > בָּאֵיה > מַבֶּאֶיה

The transitional form would not make sense and this might explain why a scribe may have read a simple plural participle.

The loss of the conjunctive Vav may be accounted for in either language as a haplography before Yod.

The difference in the participial form is difficult to explain in Aramaic, chiefly because of two Alephs in the emphatic plural participle of root קלח.

4) נְבֵיתָמִיקָה

MT reads literally ‘he who strengthened her’, i.e. ‘supported her’, or ‘he who took hold of her’, being interpreted variously as either Antiochus II, Berenice’s husband, or Ptolemy, her father. Hartman pointed out that the Hiphil of בִּין is not used anywhere else with the sense of ‘marry’. Nevertheless, a reference to King Antiochus II, the husband of Berenice, whose murder preceded hers, would suit the context best.

Theodotion, the Peshitta and Vulgate have all understood the verb to mean ‘strengthen / support’. Jerome and the Peshitta have plurals, which denote both

---


126 Ibid. There is no parallel verb as in Proverbs 3:18, to indicate the particular sense of בִּין intended.

127 Montgomery, cf note 125, equates the א text with ‘he who obtained her’, but this is better understood from the Greek verb κατασχέων rather than κατασχεῖν; cf pages 343-5: Collins is probably correct in his assessment of Theodotion here.
kings, or her retinue, and which may reflect metathesis of the Yod in the Hiphil participle.

Once again OG provides a different reading in קֶּבֶּה, which means ‘and he will remain / stand fast’, and which Montgomery retroverted to הָיָהוּ וּלְהַבֵּר, without explaining why OG lacks a pronoun equivalent of the suffix in Hebrew. Ginsberg failed to address the problem of the OG reading: he suggested the Hebrew derived from Aramaic הָיָהוּ וּלְהַבֵּר which was misread.¹²⁸ Hartman added that the misreading was probably לְהַבֵּר.¹²⁹ It may be possible for Mem to be lost between, or formed from a ligature of, Vav and Gimel, but this is not a straightforward mechanical error.¹³⁰

Before weighing these views it is necessary to determine whether קֶּבֶּה genuinly has any semantic common ground with קָרֹד. According to HRP this equivalence is unique and problematic: of the other sixteen Hebrew roots it is used for, none is a clear synonym of קָרֹד.¹³¹ Those that may overlap in semantic range with קָרֹד are only קָרֹד, קָרֹד, וּלְהַבֵּר and קָרֹד in the sense of ‘be firm, secure’. LS lists the meanings of קֶּבֶּה as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{קֶּבֶּה} & \quad \text{stand fast (in battle); stay at home, where one is; lodge, stay;} \\
& \quad \text{tarry, loiter, be idle; be lasting, remain, stand, remain as one was;} \\
& \quad \text{abide (by an opinion); (impersonal) it remains;} \\
& \quad \text{(transitive) await, expect, bide (the storm), wait for.}¹³²
\end{align*}
\]

The meaning of קֶּבֶּה in the context as it is construed in ν 6 of OG is vague: it may indicate the king of Egypt will stay some time in the kingdom of

---

¹²⁸ Ginsberg, Studies, 47, note to section (a).
¹²⁹ Hartman & Di Iella; cf note 125.
¹³⁰ See scripts, op cit. Whereas Vav might provide the needed right-hand curved stroke of a Mem, Gimel would have to be extremely skewed upwards towards the left to form the rest of the letter; that is unless a Vav and Gimel coalesced in the right-hand stroke.
¹³¹ HRP 910. The roots listed, less two negatives, are: לְהַבֵּר, תֹּבֵר, הָיָהוּ הָיָהוּ, קֶּבֶּה, Piel, Hiphil, אָרְדָּן, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל, נֶפֶל.
north, or he will remain in power in Egypt. It could even mean that the king will stand fast in battle, if it were certain that OG expresses the idea of battle in ὀ̂ βραχίων αὐτοῦ οὐ στηρεῖ ἰσχῦν, καὶ ὀ̂ βραχίων αὐτοῦ ναρκήσει καὶ τον συμπορευόμενον μετ’ αὐτοῦ. Whatever the case, it is clear that, despite the vast semantic range of πίπτω, the Greek verb does not share any of its transitive meanings: and of the intransitive senses of both verbs, there is only ‘be firm (in principle)’ and perhaps ‘be firm in courage’, in common. So while it is possible that Montgomery was correct and the Greek translator arrived at κατ’ μένει from the root πίπτω, it is a unique equivalence in the Greek versions. If the pronoun suffix was lost first, this would have enabled the translator to construe the verb intransitively. The participle in MT might mean ‘her supporter, sustainer’, in which case it could mean either her father or her husband, but the future verb in Greek is the equivalent of a Semitic imperfect.

Ginsberg correctly pointed out the unique use of πόνος in MT, and provided the Aramaic הָבָר as an alternative, and it is possible, mechanically, that He of a third feminine singular suffix was lost before the Resh of הָבָר. This would account for the lack of possessive pronoun in OG. However, the fact is that הָבָר does not mean ‘husband’, but ‘man, male person’; the correct term would be חַלָּל, and if this had been in an Aramaic text it would reasonably have been translated by Hebrew בעל or איש. Root בעל can mean ‘embrace’ and this may be the meaning of MT in this context.

---

133 This depends on whether ὀ̂ βραχίων is to be taken literally, or whether it carries the sense of the Semitic term בֵּיתוֹ, ‘power, force, army’.
134 See BDB, 304; KB3, Vol 1, 302-4; CI, Vol 3, 184-90.
135 In Lev 25:35 it means provide for a debtor, and in 2 Chr 28:15 provide for returnee captives.
136 Cf page 301, note 46; here the He would be lost between Resh and Vav.
138 A Hebrew translator may have been reluctant to use the word בעל because of its connotations of the Baal cult, but it is used in 8:6 in the sense of ‘owner, possessor’.
139 Ja, Vol 1, 182.
140 The Hiphil of πίπτω is used with פָּנָה, ‘kiss’ in 2 Sam 15:5 in the context of a public show of affection, and in Prov 7:13, in the context of public sexual seduction; but these hardly justify the meaning ‘husband’. 
Then, if the Hebrew participle פִּיתָם can mean ‘one who embraces’, i.e. a ‘husband’, there is no need to look for an Aramaic word behind it at all!

Another Aramaic solution might trace OG מַעְנֵי and MT פִּיתָם to one of the equivalents for מַעְנֵי listed in HP, the Hebrew root רְאַק, to ‘tarry’. This has a cognate root in Aramaic which means to ‘tarry, hesitate’ in both the Pael and Aphel stems. It could easily be mistaken for the verb רְאַק which in its causative stems means to ‘seize’, a sense shared by the Hiphil of פִּיתָם. The passive participle is also used to mean ‘one holding’ in Targ Am 2:15, אַתְשֵׁת כִּרְאַק, ‘one holding a bow’, but there is no evidence for this expression used in the context of marriage. So this solution suffers from the same uniqueness of meaning for רְאַק which is attributed to Hebrew פִּיתָם in this context.

Another meaning of רְאַק that could be considered is to ‘join’, which is connected with the numeral רְאַק, ‘one’ i.e. ‘a unity, unit’. The sense ‘joined, one’ is of course a definition of marriage; see Gen 2:24; Mk 10:8; Mt 19:6; but to construe a participle such as חַיֵּיתָן to mean ‘her joined one’ i.e. ‘her husband’ is rather awkward. The cognate Hebrew root רָאָק is used in 4Q416 2.45 of a man united with his wife, but with the preposition ב. There may have been some Aramaic expression meaning ‘husband’ from the root רְאַק, which underlies the Hebrew here, but this can only be speculation.

5) בֵּעָתִים

This vague phrase of time has been transposed by a number of scholars to the beginning of v 7, but as Montgomery points out, ‘in the times’ is still a ‘hopeless’

---

141 See Ja, Vol 1, 38-40 for both these Aramaic roots.
142 In this respect פִּיתָם is a synonym of Hebrew פֶּתָק which is cognate with Aramaic פֶּתָק; ibid.
143 Montgomery, A Critical, 430; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 257 with note u, 266.
sense in context. Bevan thought that some word had fallen out and that the
equivalent הוהי. Hartman after transposition and
adopting the addition of יוהי translated ‘Later...’, and Collins, keeping the word in
v 6 because of the conjunction following, rendered it ‘in due time’. 144

The Versions all support MT except for the Peshitta, which has a singular noun with demonstrative adjective, giving a more precise sense, but still attached to v 6.

The historical situation would support those scholars who wish to transpose to v 7, since the rise of Ptolemy III took place before the death of his sister Berenice, 146 so that the sense of the Syriac transposed to v 7 would give the best meaning: ‘At that / this time there will arise a scion...’. A lost demonstrative adjective and additional conjunction could easily have fallen out in Hebrew or Aramaic, as can be seen from the following comparisons, without vowel letters in the plural forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>בּוּתֵם יִעְמוֹר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew emendation with singulars</td>
<td>בּוּתֵת הָוָה יִעְמוֹר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בּוּתֵת הָוָה יִעְמוֹר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with plurals</td>
<td>בּוּתֵם הָוָה יִעְמוֹר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT &gt; Aram</td>
<td>בּוּדֵנִיא יִקּוֹמ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramaic emendation with singulars</td>
<td>בּוּדֵנִיא רֵהוּ קִקּוֹמ , as in BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בּוּדֵנִיא רֵהוּ קִקּוֹמ , as in QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with plurals</td>
<td>בּוּדֵנִיא אֲלְלֵי קִקּוֹמ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בּוּדֵנִיא עָזְהוּ קִקּוֹמ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

144 Ibid. Bevan, A Short Commentary, 174; Collins, Daniel, 364 and note 17.
145 Taylor, The Peshitta, 281, notes the Peshitta has singulars for the same Hebrew word in vv 13, 14.
147 The alternative orthography, נוּטִיל, is well attested in Aramaic; cf KB3, Vol 5, 1854. It occurs once in 1QapGen, in 2:5; cf Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 2, 82.
The plural forms offer a solution best in Hebrew with the line בֶּעַטַּמְטָם יְהִ֣וָּל דַּעַ֣ם הֹלֵ֑מִים where the Yod has become Vav and the demonstrative has fallen out by homoioteleuton, entailing the loss of three consonants, to produce the MT reading. Loss of the singular form of the demonstrative is most probable in the Aramaic line דַּעַ֣ם הֹלֵ֑מִים because the whole of the demonstrative pronoun is contained in the ending of the noun; but the conjunction in the equivalent of MT would then be a dittography of Yod. Perhaps the real solution is a composite of this one in Aramaic, because the singular forms give the most logical sense, with conjunctive Vav developing in Hebrew.

11:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>OG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לא יתעח</td>
<td>καὶ οὐ μὴ φοβησθή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>και ου κατισχυετ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sed non praevalebit</td>
<td>Syh ןהש רפוי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ס</td>
<td>מֶּלֶךְ דֶּנִּים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phrase exhibits a semantic difference between MT and OG similar to the expression דַּעַ֣ם הֹלֵ֑מִים in 11:31, where OG read το ἀγιὸν του φοβος, and there is a similar choice of solutions. Montgomery, followed by Collins, resolved the problem in terms of a Hebrew graphic error between third singular masculine imperfects of the roots הָנַע, and יַע meaning to ‘tremble, quake’.

MT, supported by Theodotion, the Peshitta and the Vulgate, has the meaning, ‘but he will not be strong / prevail’. OG gives the sense ‘but he will not fear / be put to flight’. It has been noted in the previous case that, whilst trembling and fear are obviously associated, φοβηστυ is not the standard equivalent of יַע, but of קָרַב in Hebrew and of לְהָדַד in Aramaic. It is possible that here is another example of a

confusion in Aramaic between roots הָרִי and הָרִיָּה, and this solution has the potential to produce a more historically accurate meaning than the one in MT.

Hartman translated the phrase ‘but he will gain no territory’, basing this on a retroversion of MT to Aramaic הָרִיָּה כֹּלָה יִרְדֵּא, Haphel of Aramaic root הָרִיָּה, which can mean ‘gain possession’. He failed to account for the OG reading, as well as overlooking the fact that Ptolemy IV regained Coele-Syria. It is more likely that the Aramaic root הָרִיָּה lies behind the Hebrew reading.

There are other cases in which forms with the consonants הָרִי in MT itself may have been read as some form of הָרִי הָרִי הָרִי (as an Aramaism), by a translator, and these are worth noting before retroversion of the phrase in Daniel 11:12.

A double example of the translator of a targum apparently reading a form הָרִי הָרִי הָרִי for noun הָרִי can be found in MT 1 Kgs 1:42, 52:

| 1 Kgs 1:42 | MT | נַעֲשֶׂה הָרִי אָתָה  |
|           | Targ O | אוּר גֵּר הָרִי חַטַּאֵנִי אָת |
| 1 Kgs 1:52 | MT | אָם חָיוֹת לְבֵן הָרִי |
|           | Targ O | אָמְכוֹ חָיוֹת לְבֵן הָרִי חָטַאֵנִי |

Here the meturgeman has evidently read in MT בַּן הָרִי כֹּל אֵין and has interpreted this in context as a person with fear of sins (or sinners).

---

150 BCTP, Vol VI, 265; cf Vol VIII, 336.
151 D J Harrington & A J Saldarini, Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets: Introduction, Translation and Notes (Aramaic Bible 10, 1987, Edinburgh, T & T Clark), 213-14 and notes 52. The notes do not make the textual error explicit, though they provide MT readings: note 52 seems to imply the sense of the Targum is merely interpretative.
A further occurrence is found in a double example in Ezek 2:5, 7: in both these verses where MT reads לֹוָלַיִם וָאֵל, ‘or if they will refrain’, LXX reads ἐὰν πτοηθοῦσι, ‘or if they will be scared’. This has been recognised as metathesis in the Vorlage of LXX to produce the Hebrew text לֹוָלַיִם twice.\footnote{Allen, Ezekiel, 11, note 5b; HRpSp 245; HRp 1238 has these readings with an obelus. Cooke, A Critical, 36, lists support for the LXX as OL, S and Arabic. There are less clear examples in 1 Chr 16:30 // Ps 96:9 and Ps 77:17 with the forms לֹוָלַיִם or לֹוָלַיִם: in two of these LXX translates with φοβεῖν and in one with σαλαφεῦν. (See listings of HRpSp 258, 256; HRp 1433-4.)}

Given that occasional confusions occur between root לֹוָלַיִם and graphically similar roots in the Hebrew text of MT, it is not unlikely that such confusion would occur in an Aramaic text. Here in Dan 11:12 there may have been confusion between verbal forms of לֹוָלַיִם to ‘strengthen’ (Pael) and לֹוָלַיִם to ‘fear’ in an Aramaic manuscript. Aramaic equivalents of the verbs could be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Aram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לֹוָלַיִם</td>
<td>לֹוָלַיִם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֹוָלַיִם</td>
<td>לֹוָלַיִם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{152 Allen, Ezekiel, 11, note 5b; HRpSp 245; HRp 1238 has these readings with an obelus. Cooke, A Critical, 36, lists support for the LXX as OL, S and Arabic. There are less clear examples in 1 Chr 16:30 // Ps 96:9 and Ps 77:17 with the forms לֹוָלַיִם or لֹוָלַיִם: in two of these LXX translates with φοβεῖν and in one with σαλαφεῦν. (See listings of HRpSp 258, 256; HRp 1433-4.)}

The Hebrew verbs could be from roots לֹוָלַיִם or לֹוָלַיִם, which have a range of meanings: BDB 297 treats these verbs under one root, whereas later lexicons recognise לֹוָלַיִם and לֹוָלַיִם as separate; cf KB3, Vol 1, 297, 310-311; Cl, Vol 3, 171-2, 212-213. The main concern is with the sense ‘tremble’ which is associated with fear. It is true that some variants of OG translate verbs with a similar sense to the root לֹוָלַיִם with the rather less graphic term φοβεῖν: e.g. in Exod 15:14 where MT reads לֹוָלַיִם קַיְּיַמֵּשׂ, LXX reads ἐφίσσασθαι εἰδικεῖσθαι, but A has ἐφίσσασθαι for the second verb; in Jer 49:21 MT reads לֹוָלַיִם קַיְּיַמֵּשׂ, LXX (30:15) reads εἰδικεῖσθαι ἢ γὰρ, but B, S, read ἐφίσσασθαι for the verb. These occurrences are rare and, in the light of the examples that occur in 1 Kings and Ezekiel above, it is possible that what we have in 1 Chronicles and Psalm 77 above are confusions between verbs לֹוָלַיִם and לֹוָלַיִם, לֹוָלַיִם and לֹוָלַיִם respectively.
The passive verb in Greek which means ‘he was not afraid’ requires either the Peal or Ithpael stem in רדך for the same sense. The plene spelling of the Peal stem would give the best graphic resemblance to any form of רדך, and the Ithpael third masculine singular imperfect of רדך may have the form יִדְרַךְ which is even more likely to have given rise to the mistaken reading יִדְרַךְ because, allowing for elongated Yods, there would have been the same number of down-strokes before the Lamed.154

Aramaic רדך in the Pael is only attested with the meaning to ‘strengthen’, and the Ithpael must be employed in retroversion to provide the same sense as Qal of רע, to ‘be strong’. It is interesting that the Ithpael of רדך has a range of meanings that is not available in the Hebrew root רע, which includes to ‘move into war, gather together’.155 The sense ‘but he will not go to war’ more accurately describes the attitude of Ptolemy as noted in the commentaries, since he was unwilling to follow up his victory at Raphia with further campaigns.156

---

153 This is based on forms cited by Ja, Vol 1, 292 and Sokoloff, 143. From Sokoloff’s list of Peal forms of רדך it is also possible to extrapolate imperfect יִדְרַךְ which could have been confused with יִדְרַךְ.

154 Plene spelling for Ithpael of רדך is also attested, e.g. Targ Job 6:16 יִדְרַךְ; 10:17 יִדְרַךְ; but TargO Num 31:7 יִדְרַךְ. The imperfect plene form יִדְרַךְ would provide seven, and not six down-strokes.

155 Ja; cf note 153.

156 Bevan, A Short Commentary, 179-80; Montgomery, A Critical, 436-7, does not refer to the failure of Ptolemy to follow up his victory; Charles, A Critical, 286-7; Collins, Daniel, 379; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 291.
11:15 י渙فتر סופלתי

MT י渙فتر סופלתי
4QDan⁸ וסואפ סופלתי
4QDan⁹ וסואפ סופלתי
θ καὶ έκχεει προσχώμα
V et comportabit aggerem
OG καὶ ἐπιστρέψει τὰ δορὰτα αὐτοῦ
967 καὶ τῷ ἀντὶ ταύτα
Syll סולח

‘He will set up a ramp’ (literally ‘pour out a ramp’), is the sense of MT and it is supported by two Qumran fragments, Theodotion and the Vulgate. Though 4QDan⁸⁹ have perfect consecutive verbs instead of the imperfect with Vav conjunctive of MT,¹⁵⁷ the meaning is the same. The Peshitta means ‘he will lay an ambush’, and OG, supported by 967 and the Syro-Hexapla, reads ‘he will return / turn back his spears’! The Peshitta is difficult to account for in this reading, unless it denotes some particular understanding of a ‘ramp’ as a form of hiding place.¹⁵⁸

None of the commentaries have any suggestions as to the reasons for such divergence between OG and MT.¹⁵⁹ Collins attempts to explain the verbal variation by suggesting that OG read סֵפֶל for the root סֵפֶל. This would involve the confusion of Shin with He, which is not easy in any script. It is more likely that

¹⁵⁷ Jeansonne, The Old Greek, 15 says the verbs of both MT and Qumran are ‘converted’, but this is not the case.

¹⁵⁸ Weitzman, The Syriac, 21, noted that סולח is generally understood as ‘ambush’ in the Peshitta. Targ 1 Kgs 20:12 used the root להב for Hebrew לְהִב, so the Vorlage of the Syriac in Dan 11:15 may have had בהב for לְהִב, rather than בהב which produced the OG reading. The standard Hebrew equivalent for Aramaic בהב is מַרְבִּק.

¹⁵⁹ Most do not address the problem: Montgomery, A Critical, 440, only raises a query in his notes; Collins, Daniel, 365, note 43, records the OG variant but only deals with the verb as above.
Kaph was lost between Pe and Samek since all three letters curve in the same
direction: after this Pe was read as Bet resulting in the verb רְשָׁבָה.

The misreading of a Semitic word meaning ‘ramp’ for one meaning ‘his spears’ is not
as unlikely as it appears at first. In Hebrew, common words for ‘spear, lance,
javelin’ such as רְשָׁבָה שְׁלַלְתָּה, or רְשָׁבָה נְטִיָּה, would not be easily confused with סִלַלְתָּה, and
indeed the double Lamed is difficult to mistake for other letters unless there has been
some damage to the medium. There is the term הָלַשׁ, ‘missile, weapon,’ which is
used in Neh 4:11, 17; 2 Chr 25:10; 32:5; Joel 2:8. Confusion between סִלַלְתָּה and
the equivalent of the OG, שְׁלַלְתָּה, would have been possible if Samek was replaced
by Sin, and a Lamed was lost. Thus, with the verb which follows, forms שְׁלַלְתָּה
כָּלְבָד could have become שְׁלַלְתָּה כָּלְבָד. The lost Lamed could even have become
יְוד if the upper stroke was obliterated, but this would mean a metathesis with הָיֶּלֶת as
well, which was read as הָיֶּלֶת. So this is quite a complicated textual error, and it has
the disadvantage that שְׁלַלְתָּה is rather a general term, rather than specifically a ‘spear’.

QH has the word כְּרָד in 1QM 62, 3, 16 which means ‘javelin’, plural כְּרָדִים, and the
root כְּרָד in Hebrew and Aramaic means ‘scatter, sprinkle, strew, toss, cast, throw,
thrust’.

Since the root has this range of meaning, it is possible that there was an
expression, and for this purpose it would have to be in Aramaic, that meant ‘cast /
throw up a ramp’, similar to the one in Hebrew סִלַלְתָּה מַסָּל ‘cast up a highway’.
However, since this expression is not attested, it can only remain a speculation.

---

160 See BDB 1019; KB3, Vol 4, 1516-17. HRp 359, lists LXX words for הָלַשׁ as: ἀποστολή;
βελος; βολις; οπλον; πολεμος.

161 BDB 284: KB3, Vol 1, 283; Cl, Vol 3, 144-5; Ja, Vol 1, 414-15; Sokoloff 182;
see also כְּרָד in Ja, Vol 1, 325.

162 QA has the noun כְּרָד for ‘spear’ in TgJb 335, which Greenfield & Sokoloff, ‘The Contribution’, 90
recognise as a Persian loan-word. See also כְּרָד in P Simpson, Tomus II, 2330. There is no Aramaic or
Semitic cognate root that would indicate this word is the answer to the problems in Dan 11:15.
The most likely solution is to be found in Aramaic standard equivalents: מָלְיָה is the usual term in the Targums for רֹגֶה, and מָזוּרָה is the translation for רֹגֶה மட்டும். This confusion requires, like the Hebrew one, no vowel letters and the loss of the upper stroke of Lamed, this time to leave the appearance of Resh. It additionally requires the acquisition of Nun, possibly a ditography of Resh or Yod and the use of the emphatic form in the expression. The determinate is the norm in the Targums: it is used for equivalents of Hebrew רֹגֶה and סֶלֶשׁ in Targums of Isa 37:33; Jer 6:6; 32:24; 33:4; Ezek 4:2; 17:17; 21:27; 26:8. The feminine noun מָלְיָה has the advantage over a Hebrew noun that, if written with He instead of Aleph as the final consonant, it could be read as singular or plural, with or without a third person singular pronoun suffix. It would therefore be ambiguous enough to produce in translation the singular substantive of MT with no suffix, and the plural noun of OG with a third person masculine genitive pronoun.

11:24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>נְבָרוּ</th>
<th>בְּנֵי הַשָּׁלֹם וְכֻלָּם לָם בִּיוֹדָר</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>προνομήν και σκῦλα καὶ ὑπαρξάν αὐτοίς διασκορπιέ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>rapinas et praedam et divitas eorum dissipabit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>אֵּשָׁהוּ בְּּוֹדָר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG &amp;967</td>
<td>προνομήν και σκῦλα καὶ χρηματα αὐτοίς δώσει</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syh</td>
<td>יִּלְלוּ אָשֵׁן אֵּשָׁהוּ בְּּוֹדָר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not clear whether רֹגֶה can carry any other meaning than ‘scatter’ in Hebrew, and this is reflected in the translations of Theodotion and Jerome. OG uses a general verb which could be a response to the context or an alternative Vorlage. רֹגֶה has been recognised as an Aramaism, i.e. a Hebrew form of Aramaic רֶגֶב, which itself is

163 On this inner Syriac error see Taylor, The Peshitta, 265, 284.
164 Cf Chapter One, page 37.
the equivalent of Hebrew מָשַׁר, to scatter.\(^{165}\) However it is not clear why, in that case, the MT verb is not intensive in stem, which usually denotes distribution rather than scattering, as is evident from the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Qal</th>
<th>Dan 11:24 only;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מָשַׁר</td>
<td>Piel</td>
<td>Ps 68:31, to scatter(^{166})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Peal</th>
<th>scatter, strew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בָּרָר</td>
<td>Pael</td>
<td>disperse, distribute freely, shake (in sieve), tread olives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ithpaal</td>
<td>be scattered, dispersed(^{168})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only other occurrence of בָּרָר in Ps 68 is in the Piel stem, and the only occurrence of בָּרָר in BA, in Dan 4:11, is in the Pael stem. This would suggest that the pointing here in Dan 11:24 should be Piel. The root is certainly an Aramaism, but it is not clear if it is a calque. It is no certain evidence for an Aramaic original.

---

\(^{165}\) KB3, Vol 1, 118; Montgomery, A Critical, 453; Charles, A Critical, 300; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 269.

\(^{166}\) BDB 103; KB3, ibid; CI, Vol 2, 134; Ja, Vol 1, 154.

\(^{167}\) BDB 808; KB3, Vol 3, 921.
The chief problem in this clause is the difference between MT יֶבַע, ‘will escape / be delivered’, and its counterpart in OG יֹּשְׁבֵ֥שֶׁתַּי, ‘will be exalted / raised up’. The secondary difference, the lack of pronoun in OG to render the suffix on רָע, is easily understood as a Hebrew haplography (or dittography in MT) of Kaph because of לְךָ which follows, and which OG translates by πᾶς. The variant in the Peshitta הנח חֲצִינָה reflects the occurrence of the same phrase earlier in the verse.

Greek Solution

Montgomery noted the different meaning in the OG verb as due to the inner Greek error of יֹּשְׁבֵ֥שֶׁתַּי for שָׁבְּשֶׁתַּי, which is Theodotion’s reading, but McLay does not accept this solution. Certainly there seems little reason to find a graphic error in the uncial forms:

\[ \text{Θ} \quad \text{ΕΚΕΙΝΩ ΣΩΘΗΣΕ Таİ} \]

\[ \text{ΟΓ ΗΜΕΡΑ ΥΨΩΘΗΣΕ ТаI} \]

Miniscule script might have produced the error if Psi was a reduplication of Omega, and Sigma was corrupted to Upsilon. Alternatively there may have been an aural error.

---

168 BDB 1084; KB3, Vol 5, 1831-2; Ja, Vol 1, 141; Sokoloff 86.
169 Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 210-11 restored the Θ reading in OG; cf Montgomery, A Critical, 473.
170 Jeansonne, the Old Greek, 118.
171 Taylor, the Peshitta, 290, notes that the addition of י is interpretative of only some of Daniel’s people escaping the time of distress.
172 Montgomery, A Critical, 473.
173 McLay, The OG and Th, 186, 247: he accepts the OG verb as original against Ziegler who restored the Θ reading in OG; Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 210.
error in which the first syllable of לְגָאָל was not heard. This would assume that OG is original. These remain possibilities.

Hebrew Solution

The standard Hebrew equivalent of לְגָאָל is וֹדוָר and this is reflected in the Greek translations of Daniel,¹⁷⁴ but there is not much likelihood of a graphic error between וֹדוָר and מָלֵך. The latter might be confused with the Aramaic נְבָל, which does occur in Hebrew, in 2 Sam 24:12, Lam 3:28, Isa 40:15, 63:9: the form מָעְלֶה could have been read as נְבָל, which would involve confusion of Mem and Nun, and metathesis of Lamed and Tet. This is certainly possible, and it would account for the OG meaning ‘will be exalted, raised’, but it is not straightforward.¹⁷⁵

Aramaic Solution

There is no obvious verb with which the root נְבָל could be confused and which means to ‘be saved / be delivered / escape’. Neither is there an Aramaic root to provide an obvious link between the semantic ranges of Hebrew מָלֵך and Greek לְגָאָל.

Composite Solution

The verb in OG probably reflects the standard equivalent, Hebrew וֹדוָר: i.e. לְגָאָל should be retroverted to Hebrew וֹדוָר, but this could be pointed as a Qal imperfect וֹדוָר or a Hophal imperfect הָלוֹר (the Qal imperfect is found in 11:12 and the perfect Hophal in 8:11Qr). The OG may have read the former to give the sense ‘will be raised / exalted’ whereas the intended sense may have been the Hophal imperfect, ‘will be removed’. The same semantic confusion could have arisen if the Hebrew root was כָּשָּר, which in the Niphal can mean either ‘be lifted up, exalted’ or

¹⁷⁴ McLay, The OG and Th, 202, 1. 82.
¹⁷⁵ This solution accepts the meaning of Hebrew לְגָאָלas given in BDB 642, ‘lift, bear’: KB3, Vol 2,
‘be carried / taken away’. Would give a superior solution to the verb רイメージ in that no difference in the placement of mater lectionis need be assumed, and it is used in 11:12; but רイメージ is the more commonly used root in Daniel.

The standard Aramaic equivalent of Hebrew ממלך is the Shaphel בושי, but this gives no possible semantic link with either senses, ‘be exalted’ or ‘be removed’. Another equivalent used in the Targum of Samuel is פאנים which has a broad semantic range including to ‘separate, remove, redeem, deliver’ in the Peal. It is attested with the meaning ‘be delivered’ in the Ithpael. If a passive form could also mean ‘be removed’, then the ambiguity in the meaning of such a form could be the basis of the divergent senses found in the MT and OG verbs. This is a solution with misunderstanding in two different stages of translation, and it can hardly be adduced as proof for an Aramaic Vorlage.

If one solution must be preferred, it seems likely that the Hebrew root בושי provides it, though this root is an Aramaism in Hebrew.

694, gives the senses ‘impose, lay upon’, with the Piel in Isa 6:39 (sic), meaning ‘lift up’.
Where MT has a plural noun, וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב, all the Versions have a singular, and this must be taken into account in an explanation for the rare word וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב, which is singular.

Montgomery translated here, ‘and some to reproach, to everlasting abhorrence’, and he noted cryptically that OG contained a doublet correcting an error, apparently וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב for וּדְיַדַּרְדָּרָּב, translating וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב. The lack of conjunction in MT, supported by the Vulgate, suggests that the gloss was originally in Hebrew, וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב, explaining the rare term וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב, which in Isa 66:24 is usually taken to mean ‘abhorrence’ or some similar sense. The conjunction may have been added in the Vorlage of θ, or the Greek translator added it for a smooth reading. וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב is the standard equivalent for וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב and וּדְיַדַּרְדָּרָּב is a synonym.

---

176 Montgomery, A Critical, 471, 473. Collins, Daniel, 369, note 8, attributes the double reading to 967 only, i.e. ‘dispersion and shame’, which alludes to וּדְיַדַּרְדָּרָּב, which alludes to וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב, and this is followed by McLay, The OG and Th, 186.

177 As noted by Charles, A Critical, 328. Jerome, in employing the subjunctive, seems to have read an infinitive of וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב / וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב, or perhaps even Niphal וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב / וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב instead of וְדַיְדַרְדָּרָּב. This contains another example of confusion between Vav and Vav, Nun.
The greater problem is the source of the OG διασποράν, which Ziegler recognised was an alternative for אִישְׁחַנְתַּת in the OG.\(^{178}\) Charles recognised the Hebrew gloss and said that all three Greek terms were attempts to render נְאֵרָה, but he found only διασποράν to be correct because he counted the Hebrew as a Aramaism\(^{179}\) from the root יְרָד, which is the equivalent of διασπειρέαν. He cited uses of the cognate Hebrew יְרָד in contexts of punishment of the wicked; however, he said of the Greek text here, 'The LXX contains two renderings of לֹא דַּרְאָוַת and one of לֹא אֲוָאֹאִית.'\(^{180}\)

To deal with the last point first, it is unlikely that the two Greek terms ὀνυεδεσμον and ἀσχύνην render the common Hebrew term נְאֵרָה, since they are both found in Theodotion, which seems to render the nouns in MT faithfully. Otherwise this would imply that the θ text had no equivalent for לֹא דַּרְאָוַת! It is not impossible that there originally was a double expression which emphasised the punishment of the wicked, in which case the conjunction may have been lost in MT or the Vav may have been moved by metathesis to make the plural form ἐπιφορά. Yet this view is not supported by the metrical balance in the line, where there are two nouns in the second colon, each with a preposition, when only one is required to parallel the term נְאֵרָה in the first colon. Logic would suggest that the process at work here was clearly the following:

1. There was originally one expression in the Hebrew text, לְדָרָא, which used a rare noun in the singular construct state. This was glossed in the margin with לֹא דַּרְאָוַת, using a well-known noun in the singular construct state.

2. MT represents a stage when the gloss was added to the main text and mater lectionis was added to make sense of the Hebrew with the plural noun ἐπιφορά, 

\(^{178}\) Ibid. McLay, The OG and Th 198, assumes the OG translator was guessing the meaning of נְאֵרָה.

the construct no longer making sense when the gloss was positioned before a preposition.

3. The Vulgate represents this stage, but with לָהַרְפָּה read as לָהַרְפָּה and with a corruption of לָלְדוֹרַת; cf footnote 177.

4. The θ Vorlage developed from the same sub-group as the Vulgate, but without the corruption of לָלְדוֹרַת, and a conjunction was added, a frequent occurrence when glosses are incorporated into texts. The two terms were understood as synonyms and translated appropriately: לָהַרְפָּה, was rendered by εἰς ὄνεαδίσμον, the standard equivalent, and לָלְדוֹרַת by εἰς ὁσχύνην, a suitable synonym.

5. The OG had a similar Vorlage to θ, but understood לָלְדוֹרַת as connected with Aramaic root כֶּרֶד/כִּרְדָא, so after using the standard equivalent for לָהַרְפָּה, the translator rendered the second term by διασποράν. Then κατ' ὁσχύνην was added later to OG from θ, as recognised by Ziegler and McLay.¹⁸¹

In this way, διασποράν and ὁσχύνην represent two different understandings of the Hebrew לָלְדוֹרַת. The Aramaic root כֶּרֶד means to 'scatter, strew, winnow'.¹⁸² There may have been Aramaic terms from this root connected with ideas of judgment, but if so, no extant example of these have been found in this study. Consequently there is no clear proof from this passage that OG is witness to anything more than an Aramaic understanding of a Hebrew term. Perhaps לָלְדוֹרַת is a Hebraised Aramaic word, but it is difficult to be certain when the only other use of it in MT, in Isa 66:24, is in the same context of the fate of the wicked.

¹⁸¹ Ziegler; cf note 176. McLay, ibid.
Although Zimmermann correctly assessed most of the variants found in the Versions here, he did not explain the verb in the OG. His solution understood the Aramaic causative form ינותך to be the basis of the Hebrew participle ינותך and he held that the Aramaic verb meant to ‘give merit’, and not to ‘justify’. This semantic solution has been rejected, in this study, as evidence for an Aramaic original with others of its type.

The OG phrase means ‘those who prevail against my words’, which is a difficult sense, and for this reason Ziegler restored κατισχοντες for κατισχοντες to give the meaning, ‘those who keep my words’. 183 Montgomery noted simply that the OG retroverted to Hebrew מנהיגי דברתי, 184 and Charles arrived at the same meaning as Ziegler by turning the Greek back to מנהיגי דברתי, ‘those who hold fast to my words’. 185 Collins seems to have accepted Ziegler’s and Montgomery’s suggestions, 186 but McLay complains, ‘there is no Semitic equivalent that can be

---

182 Ja, Vol 1, 322; Sokoloff 156.
183 Ziegler, Susanna, Daniel, 211; cf McLay, The OG and Th, 189.
184 Montgomery, A Critical, 473.
185 Charles, A Critical, 331.
186 Collins, Daniel, 369, note 11.
retroverted from κατισχοντες that is similar to נרא אחרים', and he assumes that this OG participle represents a dynamic equivalent or contextual guess.\textsuperscript{187}

Certain points can be noted concerning this phrase, though they amount to no complete solution to the problem in OG.

1. The difference between ברהים and OG τοὺς λόγους μου is certainly due to changes in a Hebrew text, because there is no term in Aramaic for ‘words’ which bears graphic resemblance to אביה/אביא. The change between ברהים and רביה entails the metathesis of Resh and Bet, the loss of Mem before Kaph,\textsuperscript{188} the loss of the left stroke of He to produce a form like Dalet. The fact that OG bears witness to a process like this shows that there was textual corruption of this word in at least one Hebrew manuscript.

2. The phrase in MT, as Ginsberg accepted, is perfectly good Hebrew and most commentators have no problem in making sense of it referring to leaders who guide others into righteous ways, as Jerome’s rendering testifies.\textsuperscript{189}

3. A graphic confusion between מָזַרְשֵׁיךְ and מְזַרְשֵׁיךְ is not improbable: this entails a change between Dalet and Zayin,\textsuperscript{190} and between Tsade and Het, which is possible in some scripts where the tops of these letters are very similar.\textsuperscript{191} The difference between MT and OG could simply be caused by a corrupt text, most probably in the Vorlage of OG.

4. Nevertheless, in answer to McLay’s complaint, there is a semantic connection in a Semitic language between the sense of the MT participle and κατισχοντες. The

\textsuperscript{187} McLay; cf note 183.

\textsuperscript{188} A ligature between reduplicated Kaph and Yod might also be considered to have produced a Mem.

\textsuperscript{189} For Ginsberg’s view cf page 86; Bevan, A Short Commentary, 202; Montgomery, A Critical, 472-3; Charles, A Critical, 331; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 309; Collins, Daniel, 393

\textsuperscript{190} The exchange was noted between MT and 4QDan\textsuperscript{5} in 11:16: cf page 137.

\textsuperscript{191} See Cowley No 22 in Naveh, The Development, Fig 9, which is fourth century; and Birnbaum,
standard equivalent of קָרַפ in Aramaic is רטלא, קדדו.192 Besides the semantic range previously listed,193 רטלא can also have the meaning ‘take possession of’ or ‘acquire a legal right to’ something;194 קאיסקיו can mean to ‘possess, occupy’. Hebrew קָבַד can also mean to ‘possess’, in the sense of ‘take hold of’, but only רטלא combines the meanings of ‘make righteous’ and ‘possess’.

To put it another way, the semantic ranges of קָרַפ, Aramaic and קאיסקיו overlap in the root רטלא, Hebrew or Aramaic, but the concern here is with the Aramaic, because MT uses Hebrew קָרַפ. It is the קָבַד – קאיסקיו equation which complicates this neat equivalence, and if an Aramaic solution is assumed without any textual corruption of the participle in either Hebrew or Greek, it can only mean that there were two Hebrew translations from an original phrase thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aramaic:</th>
<th>מתקה לשהיגיאא ( or מבאא שיגיאא )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew:</td>
<td>מתקהハードים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>OG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is therefore possible that OG and MT verbs can be traced back to Aramaic קאיסקיו, but since the suggested textual corruption in the Hebrew participle is also possible and uncomplicated, it must be assumed to be the cause of the strange reading in OG.

---

192 This root is used by Montgomery, cf note 189, in a much quoted example from Aboth, v. 26. 27, in order to explain the meaning of the Hebrew verb in this context, but this may be a medieval usage.
193 Cf pages 210-11.
194 Ja, Vol 1, 398-9: the Aramaic root shares this meaning with Hebrew קדדו.
195 To ‘overpower the many’ does not make much sense in context, but then neither does the phrase...
In this clause the usual pattern of support for MT is found and the divergence is, as often, between OG and MT. The Hebrew means, ‘and knowledge will increase’; OG has the equivalent of ‘and the earth will be full of iniquity’. Bevan retroverted OG (omitting הָגְנֹעָה), to הָנִּי יְתֵּרָה and preferred this reading, translating ‘...and many shall be the calamities’. He cited in support Isa 34:13, Jer 4:14, Zech 6:14 and Neh 13:10 as examples where a feminine plural subject takes a singular verb, and also 1 Macc 1:9 וְקָנָה הֶרֶבְשִׁיָּנָה כָּכַּהּ בְּנַחֲמִי which was understood as dependent on Daniel 12:4.196

Charles preferred the MT reading. Though he noted the popularity of Bevan’s view, he objected that the Greek verb πιμπληκτήματι was never used for ἠμβράμ because it means to ‘fill’ and is the standard equivalent of Χρήμα. He suggested that the OG verb was a corruption of πληθυνθήμι, or of πληθυνθήμι which is found in Theodotion.197 Both Hartman and Collins emend the Hebrew noun to הָנִּי יְתֵּרָה on the basis of the OG text, substituting Resh for Dalet and He for Tav, to give the overall sense ‘evil will increase’.

197 Charles, *A Critical*, 332-3. McLay, *The OG and Th*, 179, 201, considers both Greek verbs to be appropriate to translate Hebrew הָנִּי יְתֵּרָה, for he translates OG here ‘the earth be filled with iniquity’. This is despite his noting that in 11:39 both versions use πληθυνθέντι for הָנִּי יְתֵּרָה, and the different semantic range for πιμπληκτήματι; cf page 350.
199 McLay, *The OG and Th*, 201, 208, assumes the OG translator added הָגְנֹעָה.
reference to a couplet in OG: he explained ṭābākah in terms of Bevan’s emendation, ṭūnāh, and ה γη he traced to the form ṭūnāh as another corruption of ṭūnāh. He translated ‘that knowledge shall be increased’.\(^{200}\)

There are three elements in the OG text of 12:4 to account for:

a) ה γη  
b) ṭābākah  
c) πλησθή

a) ה γη

Montgomery recognised that ה γη could be traced to its Aramaic equivalent, but he failed to explain why this Aramaism should have been read in Hebrew. Although it is possible that an Aramaism was in MT, the graphic difference between ṭūnāh and ṭūnāh requires a confusion of initial He and Aleph. It is more likely that Tav had been confused with He as well, to give the emphatic form ṭūnāh.\(^{201}\) The exchange of Resh and Dalet is a common error: reading of initial Aleph is more likely in Aramaic.\(^{202}\)

e.g. תְרֹבָּה דֶּעַתָּה or תְרֹבָּה דֶּעַתָּה could have been read as תְרֹבָּה אַרְגָּע or תְרֹבָּה אַרְגָּע

This solution requires reduplication of Aleph, or, if not, of the upper stroke of the letter, to produce a final Yod in the verb. It also requires the loss of Tav before the determinative ending He. Usually an Aramaic word should be attributed to an Aramaic text; it cannot be adduced in favour of a Hebrew solution.


\(^{201}\) Montgomery’s reason for using the form ṭūnāh, apart from its nearness to ṭūnāh, is not clear. A feminine construct, or plural would not suit the context, and such forms would be hypothetical. Perhaps he was indicating a Qatlat pattern of noun; cf E Qimron, \textit{The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls} (1986, Atlanta, Scholars Press), 65.

\(^{202}\) Aleph is sometimes used as a final consonant instead of He in Hebrew verbs and nouns, but this is
This singular genitive noun in Greek can be accounted for in Hebrew terms, following Hartman and Collins, as the textual difference between הערת הדעת and תגרבה הדעת. This is not a difficult transition, but, if the correct solution, it would mean OG is a conflation of two readings, both different from MT, only one of which, ‘evil will increase’, makes sense. Could the consonantal text of MT have expanded to the Hebrew equivalent of OG by dittography? Assuming a combination of the changes suggested by Hartman and Montgomery, this is not entirely impossible:

הגרבה הדעת הדעת > תגרבה הדעת הדעת

The middle transition text means ‘and evil knowledge will increase’: alternatively perhaps the article of הדעת הדעת was a later accretion, so the transitional clause was תגרבה הדעת הדעת, ‘and knowledge of evil will increase’. The change to Aleph from He looks awkward, but it is quite possible in some scripts.

A simpler mechanical explanation is to replace הערת הדעת with הערת עון, which is the standard equivalent of ἀδικία, and which has already been noted in a variant in P967 as a reading instead of עון. This might have given the following sequence in a Hebrew text:

תגרבה הדעת עון

This requires the reduplication of only Ayin and then Tav written as the two consonants Vav and Nun, so it is a simpler solution than the previous one. However

203 A textual corruption does not have to make sense, but a solution to a textual problem is more convincing if it does. It is not very probable, as must be the case above, that two separate corruptions would be confluenced to produce a text which makes sense; conflation usually obscures or complicates a meaning, as e.g. סְרֵפָּת יָד in MT of Daniel 11:7a; cf pages 257, 260-1.
204 See e.g. Cross, ‘The Development’, 137, lines 3 and 6, mid-third and mid-second centuries.
205 Cf Chapter Four, page 135.
the Hebrew answer to the problem overlooks that fact that ניני is an Aramaic word.

Reduplication in Aramaic could have given rise to a similar sequence with the noun נני, which is cognate with Hebrew נני.

Dittography of Ayin, of Tav as Vav and Yod, and of He, would account for the transition in the text, but it is a little more complicated than in Hebrew with the form נני; yet it has the advantages of an easy explanation for Aleph in נני as a simple dittography, and the fact that the word is Aramaic. Other things being more or less equal, the last point must be decisive in favour of an Aramaic solution.

c) πληθσθη

The discrepancy between the meanings of OG πληθσθη and MT ἐβρατη noted by Charles seems very likely to be due to an inner Greek confusion between the OG verb and Theodotion’s πληθουνθη. There is nothing in the semantic range of Hebrew בְּרָת which would give the meaning ‘be full’. This solution does mean, however, that at some stage the OG must have been καὶ πληθουνθη ἢ γη ἀδικίαι, which, with the sense ‘the earth will increase in (?) iniquity’, does not read well. It would be better as καὶ πληθουνθη ἀδικία ἐν τῇ γη. There is no potential in MT for a mechanical error or semantic misunderstanding that would bring the required change of meaning to explain the difference in MT and OG.

Aramaic does not produce a clear answer to the problem either. A perusal of the Semitic equivalents of πιμπλαναη and πληθουνειν shows that they have קָלָם in common because πληθουνειν is used very occasionally for it, and they also have
‘be sated’, in common,\textsuperscript{206} which can be used in the negative sense of ‘have enough of, have one’s fill of, be weary of’; cf Isa 1:11, Job 7:4, Ps 88:3. Though this meaning would suit the OG verb, it would be difficult to misunderstand שֶׁבֶת as ‘increase’, though possibly as ‘be excessive’. Perhaps, if בֵּית in שֶׁבֶת lost its lower curve, it could be read as גימל and, with יadin read as יוד, the verb would have appeared as נַעַשׁ. This would have given the sense ‘will increase’.

There is only a remote possibility that the different meanings, to ‘increase’ of MT and to ‘be full’ of OG could be found in one original Aramaic verb. Roots כָּרָא and כָּלָא, for example, do not carry semantic ranges that cover both these senses. Root כָּבָשׁ has the following range which may be compared to the OG root:

\textbf{כָּבָשׁ} 

\textbf{Peal:} spread, increase; rise, grow, thrive; be sufficient  
\textbf{Ithpeal:} be multiplied; increase  
\textbf{Pi}m\textsubscript{3}p\textsubscript{1}a\textsubscript{3}a\textsubscript{1} active fill, fill full of; discharge  
\textbf{Pi}m\textsubscript{3}p\textsubscript{1}a\textsubscript{3}a\textsubscript{1} passive be filled, be full; be satisfied, have enough  

The only area of semantic overlap between them is the idea of ‘sufficiency’, but this is not present in all stems or voices. If the Ithpeal of כָּבָשׁ had a passive sense of ‘be sufficient’, i.e. ‘be full’ as in ‘have sufficient’, it could be argued there was an original Aramaic כָּבָשׁ which was understood to mean, in the light of the textual developments of a) and b) above, ‘will have enough’ i.e. ‘will be filled / reach its capacity’. Without the expansion of the text, the simple sense of ‘will be increased’ resulted in the MT reading. However there is no evidence from the lexicons that use of the Ithpeal of כָּבָשׁ has been found with this meaning.

\textsuperscript{206} HR\textsubscript{p}, 1133-4, πιμπλαναι, standard equivalent for כָּבָשׁ; 1144-1145, πάλινωσε. 
Chapter Eight

Summary and Analysis of Evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage to Daniel 8-12, and its Implications

Collation of Evidence

In collating the evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage for Daniel 8-12, I have set aside any textual evidence elicited which is connected to new understandings of certain Hebrew words in conjunction with similar expressions in other parts of the Hebrew Bible. These new interpretations are by-products of the research and they have been discounted in the summary of textual evidence for an Aramaic original, but they require further consideration in the context of more detailed examination of other related texts. They are:

a. the interpretation of 9:27, יחנכ וקנף שפיעים משמש וער כלא and related expressions in the light of the metaphor of the bird of prey in Jer 48:40; 49:22.¹

b. understanding the variants MT יְהַבֵּר and OG בָּחַר in 8:9 as reflecting the alternatives יִבְנָא and אָמֶה כָּרִי as found in Ezek 7:20-22, the latter word being a homograph confused with the ‘north’ also in Ps 48:3 and possibly Zech 6:8.²

Accordingly, textual evidence I have adduced in 9:27 for an Aramaic solution to the problematic וּרְאָה כָּלְהַ is not listed. On the other hand, since I have argued that the calque is not of crucial importance to the translation theory, I have included all those found in the study, including e.g. the use of שָׁמַם / שֶׁמֶם as a calque of root לָמָּה in 9:27.

¹ Pages 226-30.
² Page 290-3; in any case, this interpretation produced no clear evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage.
A number of the words and passages explored contained textual evidence which suggested Hebrew was the cause of a corruption or variant. Since this would be expected in the normal transmission in Hebrew, and I have argued that they do not negate evidence for an Aramaic original, they will not be listed here. Likewise, any which were equally soluble in Hebrew and Aramaic, or manifested an uncertain resolution have been discounted.

I have maintained the two broad categories recognised throughout the preceding chapters: calque, and textual evidence for an underlying Aramaic written text.

1. Calques

A variety of suggested calques of Aramaic in Hebrew Daniel 8-12 are listed here by scholar with additional findings in the last section.

Zimmerman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:5 דִּיחַתְיָה מעבֵד</td>
<td>8:12 פָּשֵׁע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13 דִּיחַתְיָה מעבֵד</td>
<td>8:14 נָצֶדֶק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27 דִּיחַתְיָה מעבֵד</td>
<td>9:3 לָבַךְ תְפשַל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:8 דִּיחַתְיָה מעבֵד</td>
<td>10:10 נְכוֹנִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:12 דִּיחַתְיָה מעבֵד</td>
<td>11:35 נְכָשְל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35 דִּיחַתְיָה מעבֵד</td>
<td>12:10 נְכָלָכָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Pages 58, 88; Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 82.
4 Pages 90, 92.
5 Ibid.
6 Pages 73, 210-16.
7 Page 88.
8 Page 64.
9 Pages 28, 74.
10 Pages 74-5.
11 Page 88.
12 Page 77.
Ginsberg

8:5 אֵין 15 נָרַכְמָה 16
8:27 אֵין 17 נָרֵד 18

Hartman

9:2 בֵּית בִּנְתֵי 19 בֵּינֵיהּ 20
11:6 חַיָּת 21 חַיִית 22

Additional calques identified

8:9 מְצַעֲרָה 23 מְצַעֲרָה 24 מְצַעֲרָה 25 8:12 מְצַעֲרָה 24 8:24 מְצַעֲרָה 25
9:27 שָׂמָה 32 שָׂמָה 33 10:1 עֲבָא 33

13 Page 85.
14 Ibid.
15 Pages 107-8.
16 Page 108.
17 Pages 107-8.
18 Ibid.
19 Page 116.
20 Ibid.
21 Pages 117, 217-18.
22 Page 115.
23 Pages 41, 63-4.
24 Pages 153-7.
25 Ibid.
26 Pages 303-5.
27 Page 12.
28 Pages 306-11.
29 Pages 223-5.
30 This refers to נַחֲחַת אֲשֶׁר as read by OG תַּפְּרָה; pages 232-4.
31 Page 231.
32 Ibid.
33 Pages 237-9.
These amount to 31 instances in all, and no doubt more could be found amongst those usages that have generally been classed as Aramaisms: e.g. 9:25 רָשַׁר, a 'moat', after Aramaic חַרְבִּי; 34 11:7 הַדְּחַר meaning 'prevail'; 35 11:21, 24 בְּשַׁלְוָה meaning ‘suddenly’; 36 11:24 הָבֹו meaning ‘distribute’. 37

It has not been the purpose of this study to determine the total number of Aramaisms which could better be defined as calques, or indeed to discover the full extent of Aramaic semantic, syntactic and grammatical interference in the Hebrew of 8-12. These examples suggest that the phenomenon of calque is widespread in the language of the narrative and descriptive passages, the only exception being the prayer in 9:4-19, which is generally accepted to be a Hebrew composition. 38

Although calque is a characteristic of translation in general, and is found in the Versions as an indicator of translation from Semitic Vorlagen, I have argued, in agreement with Rowley’s opinion on semantic evidence, that it cannot in this context be adduced as absolute proof of an Aramaic manuscript behind the text of Hebrew Daniel 8-12. It would take a much broader linguistic study to demonstrate that calque is more likely found in translations from manuscripts than from spoken or thought text. Such a study would have to be based on modern language examples, and any extrapolation from them to ancient usages would have to take account of the wide cross-fertilisation between the two related languages, Hebrew and Aramaic. The characteristics of language in a bilingual or even a trilingual society, and how calque is related to the competence of the translator are other relevant issues.

Nevertheless, the fact that calque of Aramaic does on a large number of occasions provide explanation for unusual and difficult Hebrew in Daniel 8-12 is evidence that

---

34 Hartman & Di Lella, Daniel, 82.
36 Zimmerman; see page 58.
37 Pages 335-6.
38 This difference is not significant enough to support the translation theory, because the familiar and stereotyped Hebrew (Deuteronomic) phrases used in the regular prayers of the pious would be unlikely to contain calque.
Aramaic had a pervading influence on the Hebrew. This influence may be easier to imagine as arising from a situation where the writer was translating from an Aramaic manuscript rather than composing in a second language, but calque alone cannot be proof of an Aramaic Vorlage. However, it can be part of the cumulative evidence because, unless the translator was very competent, or there was little mutual semantic interference between the languages, and this is hardly the case with ancient Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic, it would be unusual to find textual corruption alone, without any calque at all, in a translation based on an Aramaic Vorlage.

2. Textual Evidence

The amount of textual evidence for an Aramaic Vorlage found thus far is smaller than the amount of calque, and it falls into three categories: from understanding MT in context; from variant readings between OG and MT; from variant readings between MT and other textual witnesses.

MT in Context:

Zimmermann

8:23 ידדה, Aram homograph ידדה, read as ידדה 39

Ginsberg

8:12 יהב, Aram ידדה, cf Peshitta 40
8:24 יהב, Aram ידדה, cf Peshitta 41
11:28 יהב, Aram ידדה, cf Peshitta 42

39 Pages 216-19.
40 Pages 150-1, 204.
41 Pages 152-3, 204.
42 Pages 164-5, 204.
Additional Examples

11:6 בַּעֲדוֹנָּה > בַּעֲדוֹנָּה דָּנָּה, Aram

12:2 מִנְּהַר אָרֶץ עֶפֶר > מִנְּהַר דָּמְכָּיא דָּר עֶפֶר, Aram, מִנְּהַר אָרֶץ עֶפֶר.

These eight examples concern the meaning of MT, where the ancient Versions witness to the same Hebrew text as MT. The seven graphic errors consist of five instances where Ginsberg’s suggestion of confusion between עֶבֶר and עֶבֶר in Aramaic seem sensible, plus two additional examples of possible graphic confusion in Aramaic. The lack of variant readings is suggestive of errors which occurred early in the transmission of an Aramaic manuscript. The misreading of the Aramaic homograph which Zimmermann adduced behind תִירִדֶּר in 8:23 also seems to indicate only one translation from Aramaic into Hebrew, for the misreading has affected all the Versions, including OG.

MT v OG

Ginsberg

11:7 θεόν δυναμόν αὐτοῦ, homograph ἡ ἀλήθεια, εἰλικρίνεια וְהָיָה חַיָּה וְהָיָה חַיָּה 47

Additional Examples

8:16 ἄνθρωπος... Ἄπτι, ἡ ἀλήθεια read as ἀνθίζει 48

---

43 Pages 165-6, 204
44 Pages 185-7, 143.
45 Pages 315, 327-9.
46 Pages 284-6.
10:13 γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἱκανὸν v autov kateλιπουν, ὑμεῖς δὲ ὑπῆρξατε v autou read as ἑκατὸν / ἡμᾶς 49

11:6 καὶ ἔξει αὐτοῦς, ἔνα ἰδιαίτερα βοήθημα δοθηκε v autou / ἡμῖν 50

γένονται τὰ διὰ τὸν νῦν v ὅτι o βραχιον αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὡς read as

τὰ ἡμᾶς 51

11:7 (conflate) v φωτον ἐκ τῆς μιζῆς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὡς read as ἑκατὸν [ἱκεῖον] κέρατα μοι ἀνέφεσθε 52

11:12 καὶ οὐ μὴ φοβηθήτε, ἵνα ὡς read as / ἕμενοι αὐτοῖν 53

11:15 τὰ δορατα αὐτοῦ, καὶ καλίθη χτόλη 54

11:20 λύγι βασιλείας εἰς ἀναστασιν, ἄνη ρυπτόν δοξαν βασιλείας (conflate), ἵνα κόρα Mol; καὶ τοῦ ἐνδοφεῖτε δίνους ἔκτισθε καὶ νόμον 55

11:31 χρὴ ὡς δίκαιος οὐκ ἔρχεται διήκους v το άγιον του φοβοῦ, ἡ μορφή ἔρχεται διήκους read as

μορφή ἔρχεται διήκους αὐτοῦ 56

12:4 τὴν ὑδατικήν [καὶ πληθυσθῇ] ἡ γὰρ τὴν ὑδατικήν [καὶ πληθυσθῇ] v τοῦ ωραίου ἐσχή; 57

47 Pages 254-6, 264-5.
48 Pages 300-1.
49 Pages 311-14.
50 Pages 137-142.
51 Pages 317-19.
52 Pages 257-63.
53 Pages 329-32.
54 Pages 333-5.
55 Pages 268-83.
56 Pages 142-5.
Half the total examples, eleven in all, consist of readings in OG contra MT which can be traced to homographs or textual errors in Aramaic. Since there are readings where variants in OG can be explained in terms of Hebrew graphic errors, it is unlikely that these eleven examples point to an Aramaic Vorlage to OG; rather, they seem to indicate a different Hebrew Vorlage from MT stemming from corruptions at the Aramaic stage of transmission. Even though OG including P967 mostly support MT in the other eleven examples above, this support is no more significant than that given to MT in general, where OG reflects MT wording closely enough to prevent any theory of completely different sources for them. There is conflation in both OG and MT, and this precludes any naive acceptance of two Vorlagen developing without any reference to each other at all, for it must be accepted that conflation could take place at different stages, from early Aramaic manuscripts, through Hebrew translations and as late as Origenian corrections.

It is an important fact that some, though not all, of the surprising and inexplicable readings in OG can find explanation in corruption of an Aramaic manuscript, and this possibility of an initial Aramaic layer to Daniel 8-12 ought to be taken into consideration in assessing OG as a translation. Although issue has been taken with some of Sharon Pace Jeansonne’s particular textual solutions in Hebrew, Aramaic answers to differences between MT and OG tend to support her general thesis that OG is not a tendentious translation of MT. It is probably a translation of a translation. This can be said for the later Greek Versions too, but in the case of OG, the evidence supports the idea of a different Hebrew Vorlage from MT, yet one which developed from the same Aramaic stock.

It was not the purpose of this study to assess the OG translation of 8-12, and the Aramaic influence on this Version of Daniel is a subject which bears much more thorough exploration than has been possible here. Examination of OG of 2:4b – 7:28 with respect to textual variants and semantic equivalents may yield useful

57 Pages 346-9.
58 Montgomery, A Critical, 36; Collins, Daniel, 5.
59 This view concurs also with Collins, Daniel, 7-8.
comparative material, but the large amount of text extra to MT makes this a complicated task. The texts selected for analysis in Chapter Seven were chosen because the differences between MT and OG seemed to have potential for solution in Aramaic. When closely scrutinised this potential was not always realised, and this is because textual corruption is random and unpredictable to a large extent. For the same reason, other texts which superficially seem to have less of this potential may perhaps yield evidence for an Aramaic substratum. There is a need for close examination of all the places where OG and MT diverge in Daniel 8-12 in this respect.

**MT v Other Variants**

Zimmermann

11:2 τῆς βασιλείας, Σ. 60

11:17 ἡ ἐπίστασις τοῦ θεοῦ, P967 εἰς τὸ φθείραν αὐτῶν,

S ἡμεῖς εἶπεν, homograph ἡ ἐπίστασις τοῦ θεοῦ 61

**Additional Example**

11:2 τῆς βασιλείας τῆς γῆς τῶν ἐλλήνων.

Melchizedek read as θῆς γῆς τῶν ἐλλήνων 62

Superficially, the fact that variants between MT and the later Greek translations, Theodotion and Symmachus, 63 could be attributed to early Aramaic textual errors

---

60 Pages 247-9; cf Chapter Two, page 87 for the same graphic confusion from MT in context.
61 Pages 266-8.
62 Pages 247-50.
63 I do not include the Peshitta here because its readings are most probably internal Syriac errors in the cases considered in this study.
seems puzzling. Yet the variants in these versions generally reflect the fact that standardisation of the MT group of texts was far from perfect, a fact we also know from the variations in Hebrew manuscripts as well. The preservation of some corruptions, the correction of others and conflation of readings did not occur uniformly in all manuscripts. If early Hebrew variants, whether true readings or corruptions, can sometimes be reflected in these later ancient versions, there is no reason why some which have their source in earlier Aramaic should not also have been preserved in their Hebrew Vorlagen. If these chapters were originally written in Aramaic, awareness of this could have influenced scribes and translators of the Hebrew text, even if the Aramaic was lost. Corruptions based on Aramaic may have been spotted and corrected, but not necessarily efficiently. To turn this round, it could be said that, since MT bears witness to textual corruption in Aramaic, it would be surprising if Greek translations, whose Vorlagen are nearer to MT than that of OG, did not witness to similar corruptions occasionally.

The Significance of the Textual Examples

These are approximately twenty-two examples of words, phrases or clauses where textual solutions are more easily found in Aramaic than in Hebrew. It is difficult to adduce these as absolute proof of an Aramaic Vorlage to the Hebrew, firstly because the Aramaic texts on which these solutions are based are hypothetical, and, secondly, because textual criticism is not an exact science. However, since it is not possible to be specific concerning the number of corruptions that might be expected in a given manuscript of an ancient Jewish language, theoretically one good example of graphic error in Aramaic which explicates a difficult text in Daniel 8-12 would indicate an Aramaic Vorlage. Here we have twenty-two examples, ranging from the simple ambiguity in the pointing of the suffix nun, to a possible complex conflation of readings, as e.g. in 11:20.

It is true that these examples vary in quality as well, but this variation is probably no more than would be found in Hebrew solutions. It would not be adequate for the translation theory to rest e.g. on the difference between a solution based on Hebrew
even though Aramaic has the edge when there is variation between singular and plurals in feminine nouns because they are homographs in Aramaic consonants. Similarly with the difference between the third singular masculine and feminine pronoun suffixes which vary between Vav and He in Hebrew but are homographs in Aramaic. However, this is not the case here, because much more complicated problems such as the conflate texts of 8:16; 11:7, 20 can be resolved in Aramaic. The number and variety of textual solutions supporting an Aramaic Vorlage to the Hebrew show that a serious case can be made for the translation theory.

It has been noted that Hebrew answers to many of the puzzles in the language of 8-12 in MT and in some variants do not negate the evidential value of solutions in Aramaic. Cumulative evidence of calque and textual corruptions strengthens the case for an Aramaic Vorlage, and in cases of calque there is equally the chance that confusion lay in an ambiguous manuscript, but the solutions were attributed to semantics alone. In these two respects Daniel 8-12 fulfils the expectation of the type of phenomena to be found in a Hebrew translation from an Aramaic manuscript, and of an ancient translation of the Jewish sacred text. On this cumulative evidence, the broad assumption that Hebrew Daniel 8-12 is translated from Aramaic is entirely reasonable.

The Masoretic Text of Daniel 8-12

Previous scholarly views of MT of Daniel 8-12, that it is written in language whose sense is often obscure and heavily influenced by Aramaic, have been corroborated in this work. Much of this has found explication in calque, which exerts a less explicit influence upon meanings than use of obvious Aramaic words and roots. The key to understanding these chapters of Daniel is to ‘think Aramaically’!

Evidence has also been found to support earlier opinion that the text has had a complex transmission history, that it is characterised by textual errors and conflation;
but in contrast, these have been found attributable to a textual history in Hebrew preceded by one in Aramaic. Retroversion into Aramaic has at times produced potential for a more precise meaning in context than that available in MT, and it occasionally eradicates the strangeness in a turn of phrase.

Assessing the Contribution of F Zimmermann and H L Ginsberg to the Translation Theory

The evidence of these scholars, which has been described fully in this work, was large in amount, and they were under the impression that there were copious examples in the text which constituted proof of an Aramaic Vorlage to Daniel 8-12. Ginsberg in particular thought that the evidence was overwhelmingly in favour of an Aramaic original. The majority of scholars failed to be overwhelmed! Indeed, most of Zimmermann’s and Ginsberg’s suggestions have been found in this work to be no more than manifestations of Aramaic influence upon the Hebrew language. The forms of much of this influence might just as easily have shown the author to be a natural Aramaic speaker and writer, who felt compelled for some reason to write in Hebrew, a language in which the author had limited proficiency. Both Zimmermann and Ginsberg failed to consider adequately the similarities in influences exerted by a thought text and a manuscript, and the need for examination of textual variants.

In addition, the plethora of material listed by Zimmermann, and the complexities of Ginsberg’s textual emendations, together with his distinctive interpretation of some expressions, obscured the fact that there was a small amount of their evidence which might withstand scrutiny. This study has examined that evidence and other examples in the Hebrew of chs 8-12, aiming to avoid the weaknesses in their methods. Although it has not concurred with all their views in even this small sample of texts, it has concluded that their instincts, and those of others such as R H Charles and Hartman and Di Lella, were probably correct.
The Way Forward

There is a need to research exhaustively the semantic relations and influences between the Hebrew of Daniel and possible Aramaic lexical equivalents. Though this may not yield certainty of an Aramaic Vorlage, it may improve our understanding of some of the abstruse sections of the Hebrew, and of the relation of OG to MT. Such a study needs to include diachronic and synchronic word studies in both languages. The issue of syntactical influence of Aramaic on the Hebrew of Daniel has hardly been touched in this study. It is worthy of investigation in order to deepen our understanding of the interplay between Aramaic and Hebrew language structures. However, this requires first a thorough and long overdue description of Aramaic syntax!64

The first chapter indicated the unusually common occurrence of the Niphal stem in these five chapters of Hebrew literature. This is worthy of a discreet exploration to ascertain whether this widespread usage may be due to the influence of reflexive and passive stems in Aramaic.

Most of all there is clearly need for an exhaustive investigation of the text of Hebrew Daniel in relation to other witnesses, in the light of up to date palaeographic studies, and with a possible Aramaic Vorlage in view. A detailed comparative textual study of Aramaic and Hebrew Daniel might throw additional light on this issue of the translation hypothesis, as indeed might comparative textual study of Aramaic Ezra, thus involving the whole, albeit limited, corpus of BA texts. Another undertaking which might widen our understanding of this issue would be a textual study of Tobit, usually attributed to the third century BCE, and extant in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek.

64 Z Stefanovic, The Aramaic, 24.
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